

Tertamen Novum:
 Proving that
TIMOTHY and TITUS
 WERE
Diocesan Rulers
 OF
EPHESUS and CRETE,

By an Argument drawn from the time of
S. Paul's beseeching Timothy to abide at
Ephesus, and leaving Titus at Crete, as
 it is briefly demonstrated in the An-
 nals of *Paul*, wrote by the most Lear-
 ned Prelate Dr. *Pearson*, late Lord Bish.
 of **CHESTER.**

With an ANSWER to
an answer
J. O.'s Plea for Scripture-Ordination.

By *The* ~~Th~~ *E. A. P.* *in* *the* *year* *1711*

Inde Schismata & Hæreses aborti sunt & oriuntur, dum
Episcopus, qui unus est & Ecclesia præsit, superiorem quorun-
dum præsumptione contemnitur. S. Cyp. Ep. 66. Oxf.

London, Printed for E. Johnson, Bookseller in Manchester,
 and Sold by Hen. Nurtlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's
 Church-yard. M DC XC VI.

uu²

272

The Preface.

THE Occasion of Publishing these Papers is this. There was a certain Presbyterian Minister, who Preaching at the opening of one of their new erected Chappels, was pleas'd to quarrel at our consecrating Churches, and esteeming 'em holy, the which he endeavor'd to disprove by Scripture and a patch of Antiquity. His performance was so well thought of, that Copies of it were dispers'd up and down the Country, and one of 'em came into my hands. I took my self oblig'd to answer that Sermon, which I did in two Discourses delivered in a publick Church of the County of Lancaster. Therein I was engag'd to speak somewhat of Episcopal and Presbyterian Ordination, shewing the Divine Right of the former, and the invalidity of the latter, as well as I could in one third part of a Sermon. The Dissenters after some threat'ning of a Reply unto the said Discourses, at length thought fit to content themselves, with a Book wrote in Vindication

The Preface.

cation of Presbyterian Ordination, by J.O. entitul'd, A Plea for Scripture Ordination, &c. And printed about 2 Years since; which by the way is nothing to the first and main Argument the Consecration and Holiness of Churches; that Controversie is for ought I can learn dropt, and there is good reason for it, which I shall not here repeat. I am drawn now to another Subject, and before I enter upon it, some few things must be observ'd to the common Reader.

1. The unfair way the Dissenters have in managing Controversies. They have some general Topicks nothing to the matter in hand, wherewith they load their Adversaries and beget a prejudice against us, when all the while the poor ignorant People know not what it is that is laid to our charge; but in general they suppose it some ill thing. Ex. gr. There's scarce a Book comes forth, let it be upon what Argument soever, but we are represented as Arminians. But I would fain know what this is to the Consecration and Holiness of Places, or to the matters in controversy, between the Bishop of L. D. and Mr. B. or to the Schisms, that are risen in the Church, or to the right of Ordination contested between the Bishops and the Presbyterians. Either side may be in the right,

The Preface.

right, whatever becomes of Calvin or Arminius. Besides, there's not one of an Hundred, who will reproach us for Arminians, that knows so much as what the Opinions are, which Arminius taught; nor one of a Thousand that has sense enough to judge of those matters. But however it passes for a name of scandal, and shall be made a good reason to condemn us in every point wherein they differ from us. 'Tis a wonder to me with what confidence the little Striplings, which Mr. Fr. instructs, so soon as they have Commenc'd I know not what Degree, are ready to determine the cause between Arminius and Calvin, as if they were Doctors of the Chair. But I am perswaded, if the most understanding Calvinist would be pleas'd to represent the Opinions of that great Man in their true Colours, he would fright more out of their Wits, than he could solidly satisfy or Profelyse to his Party. And this, I say, not that I am designing to bring these abstruse Points upon the Stage. I had rather they were laid asleep, and forever buried in silence. But it is (I say) unfair at every turn to bring that Objection against us by th' head and ears, and nothing to the purpose in hand.

The Preface.

Another common Topick, is to represent the Bishops proud and haughty Persons, and chiefly, because of that Honourable Title of Lord given them: And 'tis true, whoever is Proud is an ill Man. But there is as much, and more Pride in despising Dignities, than in receiving them. And a poor and an ignorant Man, or a Man that ought to be subject, and yet is Proud, is Infinitely more Ridiculous, than one, who has some Colour for his Pride. — Besides, I do pretend to say, that the Bishops are more excusable in accepting the Title of Lord, than every Preacher is, in assuming the Title of Master. For the Law of the Nation has bestow'd that Honourable Title upon my Lords the Bishops, but not that of Master, upon all those that take upon 'em to Preach. In short, 'tis altogether as lawful, by the Rule of God's word, to be call'd Lord, as Master; and this I undertake to prove, if it be requir'd of me. In the mean time I appeal to the Quakers, who are indifferent Persons in this case, and so far honest, that they have quarrell'd, not at the Title of Lord only, but at that of Master also. If Men will deprive the Bishops of their Title of Lord, let 'em first begin to reform at home, and strip themselves of that of Master; and let us to avoid Pride, henceforward accost one another

The Preface

another, with ~~Thou and Thee~~, Tea and Nary, Roger and Jeffrey: And let K.--the Weaver be as good a Man, as the Bishop of C. The Summ is, Truth and Reason ought not to suffer, by such artifice, nor be condemn'd, because the Government has hitherto honour'd the Christian Bishops, with the Title of Lords.

A 3d. way is to fasten upon us the suspicion of Popery, and to accuse us of Symbolizing with Papists.-- For my own share, I am as great an Enemy unto the Heretical Opinions, and Superstitious Practices of the Papists, as anyone Living. But I am not for condemning a Doctrine, only, because the Papists believe it, nor laying aside a Practice, meerly, because they retain it. I look upon 'em in general, as Men of Reason and Learning, and surely they are not wrong in every thing they say or do. If all which the Papists believe, must for that Reason be rejected, we must then be both thorow pac'd Arminians, and rigid Calvinists, and yet at the same time be neither the one nor the other. If all which the Papists practise, must forthwith be exploded, there are some things that I know of, wherein the Dissenters Symbolize with the Papists, and which they will be oblig'd for ever to abandon. To be brief, Opinions and

The Preface.

Practices are not to be measur'd by the Authority of the Church of Rome, neither one way nor the other: They are not therefore good, because Countenanc'd, nor therefore evil, because establish'd by the Pope and his Councils. To dash us then in the Teeth, this the Papists do, or say, is Sophistical, and demonstrates the weakness of the Cause, or of him that manages it, rather than any thing else. Let the word of God and right Reason, the wisdom of our Predecessors, the Peace and Edification of the Church, determine our Controversies. Ipse dixit is every whit as silly an Argument against us as for us.

2. *I desire the Reader will observe, that the Controversy 'twixt the Dissenters and us, is not about the precise limits of a Diocess and number of Congregations subject to one Bishop. They may be more or less, we grant, for any thing can be determin'd from Scripture, Reason or Antiquity, and therefore they may vary. The Bishop of Eugubium, was of Old as much a Bishop, as the Bishop of Rome or Constantinople; and so the Bishop of Soder, is at this day as much a Bishop, as the Bishop of York or Chester: 'Tis therefore trick and artifice to plead, that the first and antient Bishops, had not two hundred Parishes or Congregations under 'em, as some of*

The Preface.

ours have. It sufficeth us, that they had many or several, but as for the how many, we submit to Providence, and the Determination of wise Men, and our Superiors. That there were several Congregations subject unto one Superior Governor, whom we call Bishop, even in the Beginning, is manifest from a passage in Eusebius, which I will here produce, because it has been o'er look'd of late, & I have observ'd; 'Tis

Eusebius li. i.
c. 16.

this. Τὸν δὲ Μάρκον πρῶτον Φανόντι τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐκλήψον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὃν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλάττω, κηρύξας ἐκκλησίας τι πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας συνίστασθαι, &c. Thus in English,
 " They say that this Mark being sent into
 " Egypt, did there first Preach that Gospel,
 " which himself had wrote; and first esta-
 " blish'd Churches in the very City of Alex-
 " andria. Moreover so great a multitude
 " both of Men and Women, there embrac'd
 " the Faith of Christ, &c. These Churches
 Mark govern'd as long as he liv'd, and left
 'em to Annianus his Successor, and Bishop of
 Alexandria, as is shew'd in these Papers out of
 Eusebius. Now it must needs be, when Mark
 the Evangelist came thither, there were no
 Christians at all, and it must be allow'd, that
 he converted Men by degrees, and that the

The Preface.

Church of Alexandria consisted first but of one Congregation, and that a very small one too; nor had he happily, at the Beginning, one Presbyter or Deacon with him or under him; but this cannot prejudice his Authority over the many Congregations, which afterwards, the Church of Alexandria consisted of, and over the Presbyters which officiated in them, and were Ordain'd, and Appointed thereunto by himself. Let us but suppose (what is most Reasonable) that the Number of Christians, Consequently of Congregations and Presbyters encreas'd in Alexandria and in Egypt, from time to time afterwards; and we cannot well doubt, but that Annianus the Successor of Mark was a Diocesan Bishop or Governor of many Churches or Congregations; but whether two hundred, no Man alive can tell, nor is it material to know. And what has been here noted of the Church of Alexandria, is with Reason to be understood of all other Churches; we must not believe 'em at the very first instant Diocesan de facto; some time must be allow'd for their growing up, and increasing like the Children of Israel, whose Fathers went down into Egypt with Seventy Persons, but at length were as the stars of Heaven for multitude. It had been but ill policy

Deut. 10. 22.

The Preface.

policy for the Israelites, to have Cantoniz'd themselves into many little Independent Common-wealths; every one consisting of Seventy Persons only. Yet such as this is the wisdom of some Men in our days. But when I say Churches at their first rise were not Diocesan de facto, they were nevertheless such in assign, as it is evident in the Instance of Titus, who was Commission'd by Paul to Ordain and Constitute Elders in every City. I do not believe, that when Paul first gave him those Orders, there was a Congregation of Christians in every City of Crete: But I make no scruple to say, that Titus was hereby Authoriz'd to Constitute and Ordain Elders in all and every City as the Gospel should increase. Briefly we determine not what should be the precise extent of a Diocess; nor how many Congregations the Bishop must have to preside over. That's a point of Prudence. All we pretend to say is, that a Bishop Superintends many Congregations and many Presbyters; that he who does so, is a Diocesan Governour; that Timothy and Titus were such; and that the Churches mention'd by Ignatius, were govern'd by such Diocesans. In a word, if the Dissenters will effectually overthrow Diocesan Episcopacy, they must

a 4

prove

The Preface.

prove not, that the Primitive Diocesses consisted of less than two hundred Congregations: But that Timothy, Titus, and Ignatius's Bishops had every one of 'em no more than one single Congregation to Govern. And when they have done that, I promise to submit.

3. I will take the liberty to acquaint the common Reader, with the nature of our Church Government; and shew how exactly it agrees with the Scripture, I may say in every point, except the nomination unto Bishopricks, and Parochial Cures, wherenunto the Corruption of the Age necessitates the Church to condescend, as it did even the Dissenters themselves, when they were in the Ascendant. In general, let it be observ'd, that our Episcopal Government is establish'd upon certain Canons and Laws made and consented unto by the Convocation, consisting of Bishops and Presbyters, and by the multitude of Believers, that is, their Representatives in Parliament. And thus it was in the Council of Jerusalem, Acts, 15. I've further Read, Acts, 16. 4. That Paul and Silas deliver'd these Decrees unto the Churches to be observ'd. Even at this day our Bishops are intrusted with the care of seeing the Laws of the Church observ'd. There is not one Canon in force among us, but what has been made or confirm'd, nor has any been annul'd

The Preface.

*nulled, but by the Decree and with the consent of the Bishops and Priests in Convocation, and the multitude of Believers in Parliament. Moreover, let any one run thro' the several Powers committed unto Timothy and Titus; he'll find 'em consonant to the Laws of our Church, and to the Powers of our present Bishops, such as reprov-^a a Rebuking sharply. ^b And with Authority. ^c Taking care that the Candidates for holy Orders, be duly qualified, before hands be laid on them. ^d Indea-
 vouring that the Presbyters, and such as labour in the Word and Doctrine, be encouraged with double Honour and better Maintenance. ^e Committing the care of Souls to such as are faithful and able to teach others. ^f Constituting Elders whereever there is need. In a word, Silence-
 ing. ^g Suspending and Excommunicating such as are obstinate and disobedient to the Rules and Orders of the Church. ^h*

As to the Ordaining Power in particular, let it be noted,

1. The multitude of Believers presented unto the Apostles, Seven Men of good Report, &c. And the Apostles approving the choice,

a 1 Tim. 1. 3. 5. 10.
b Tit. 1. 13. *c* 2. 15.
d 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1. 6. &c.
e 1 Tim. 5. 17.
f 2 Tim. 2. Tit. 1. 5.
g Tit. 1. 11.
h 1. 3. 10.

The Preface.

choice, ordain'd 'em to the work whereunto they were called. So the Candidates for Holy Orders among us, are commended to the Bishops, by Testimonials from those, that know them, and that certifie for 'em, as to their Lives and Conversations; but the Bishops themselves enquire into their Gifts and Abilities, and for Insufficiency are to reject them.

2. The Solemnity of Ordaining, was, Praying, Fasting, and laying on of Hands, Act. 6. 6. and 13. 3. 'Tis so among us.

3. For any thing I can learn from the Scripture of certainty, meer Presbyters, never laid on Hands at Ordinations. Nevertheless, that nothing may be omitted, for which there is any colour of preience, it is ordered amongst us, that Presbyters also lay on Hands.

For 4. Tho' because of that Passage, 1 Tim. 4. 14. which speaks of the Imposition of the Hands of the Presbytery; it is allowed by us, that the Presbyters also lay on Hands; yet there cannot be produc'd one Instance of meer Ordinary Presbyters alone Ordaining, without some Extraordinary or Superior Officer, (as Apostles, Prophets, or Evangelists) presiding over them, even as it was in that mention'd Tim. 4. 14. As
I have

To the Reader.

I have proved. And this is our way exactly. If then we must be govern'd by Scripture, as it's fit, let us in the name of God keep close to Scripture practice. Briefly the Dissenters (those of 'em I mean, who acknowledg solemn Ordinat. necessary) cannot deny Episc. Ordination to be good and valid, and in every material point rightly and duly Administred.

For they must confess, that Bishops are at least Presbyters, and by consequence, have Power to Ordain. One might then justly admire that they, who pretend to tenderness of Conscience, so as to avoid even all appearances of evil, should refuse our Episcopal Ordination, which they must grant good and valid, and betake themselves to that of meer Presbyters, which at best is but doubtful.

Now whereas J. O. pag. 9. has describ'd our Bishops thus? Which claim to be the Sole Pastors of several hundreds of Congregation, having Parish Priests * under them

who have no Power of Discipline in the Church. 'Tis his gross mistake to say no worse. The Pa.

* Let the common Reader note, that tho' the Dissenters call us Priests in contempt, yet the Word is but Presbyter contracted; and Presbyter is in Greek, what Elder is in English. So that in pure English, we are the Parish Elders; he might then if he had pleas'd have call'd us so.

rish

The Preface.

riſh-Prieſts have Power to Admoniſh and to Rebuke, which is a part of Spiritual Diſcipline, and they have Power to Suspend for a while from the Lords Supper. I would fain know whether J. O. can do thus much in his Congregation without firſt asking leave of the Lay-Elders. If not, he's more under their Girdle, than we are ſubject unto our Dioceſans. In ſhort, we Presbyters have ſome Power, and the Biſhop is not the Sole Paſtor of ſeveral hundred Pariſhes. He might as well have ſaid, that a Colonel is the Sole Captain of the Seven Companies of the Regiment.

I ſhall only add one thing more, viz. That tho' it be not abſolutely neceſſary, that the Succeſſion of Holy Orders, ſhould be certainly known and deduc'd ſtep by ſtep from the Apoſtles, (it were to be too curious and ſcrupulous to inſiſt upon this) yet is it very requiſite, that we ſhould not know of any Interruption: But it is infinite Satisfaction, when we have a Moral Assurance that there has been none.

Every wiſe and good Man then will think himſelf oblig'd to ſeek for Orders, where the Succeſſion is at leaſt with Reaſon preſum'd to have been uninterrupted. But when the Contrary has happen'd and is Notorious, and that lately

The Preface,

lately too, and without necessity, and when the error may be Corrected with ease; in such a case 'twere folly and madness to persist in the disorder and irregularity. 'Tis the case, as we suppose, of the Dissenters: For to justify their Ordinations by the example of the Lollards, is but to talk of yesterday, that is, of those, who appear'd not in the world till about Henry the 3^d's Reign. Under what insuperable difficulties those good Men labour'd, may easily be imagin'd, and in such cases, we believe God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice. But as for the Vaudois or Waldenses having had no other (Ministers than Presbyters Ordain'd by Presbyters) for near 500 Years past, as J. O. affirms in his Preface, it may happen to prove one, and not the least of his Mistakes, when I shall here have set down what a learn'd Neighbour of mine, occasionally Communicated to me upon that Subject. (For I never intended my self to follow J. O. beyond the Apostolical Times.) He told me, that he finds in the History of the Persecutions of the Church of Bohemia.

“ — That the Brethren
 “ of Bohemia were much
 “ afraid, whether when
 “ a Presbyter, (not a Bi-
 “ shop) Ordain'd a Presby-

Darell tells this Story, out of Comenius Histor: Ecclesie Scalvonicæ Dur. Eccles. Aug. Vin- dic. p. 506.

167,

The Preface.

“ter, it were valid Ordination, and how
“they might defend such an Ordination, if
“any Question were mov’d about, either at
“home or abroad. At length, after some
“Years deliberation, Anno Dom. 1467.
“about Seventy Principal Men from Bohe-
“mia and Moravia meet; and because they
“knew some of the Waldenses were in their
“Confines, that they might wholly satisfie
“their own Doubts, and the Scruples of other
“Men’s Consciences, they sent unto the
“Waldenses, Michael Zamburgius, their
“Rector, formerly Ordain’d by a Popish Bi-
“shop, with two others. These find Stephen
“the Waldensian Bishop, who taking to
“himself another Bishop and some Ministers,
“they create those three, namely, Zam-
“burgius, and the other two his Compa-
“nions, Bishops, conferring on them the
“Power to Ordain Ministers, that is, Presby-
“ters. I will not swell this Preface with the
rest of my Friends Observations to the same
purpose; this is sufficient to make a Man
doubt J. O’s. Quotations, and what he pre-
tends there to establish upon their Credit.
In Reason and Justice, therefore the Bishops
ought to have their share in that Honour,
which J. O. is pleas’d to confer upon the
Presbyters, ascribing the success of the Pro-
testants

The Preface.

restants in those parts, to their Sufferings and Labours only.

But to conclude, we of the Church of England have a strong Presumption and Moral Assurance of the Uninterrupted Succession of our Orders, and greater than this, no Church in the World has or can have. Hereby we are able not only to stop the Mouths of our Adversaries the Papists; but to overcome all scruples of Conscience in our selves, which is no small Satisfaction to us. We are nothing concern'd at that Objection about the deriving our Orders from the Papists, which has nothing in it. For we are at the same time sensible, that both we and the Dissenters too receiv'd the Power from them. The Divine Oracles were committed unto them for a great while, and yet are never the worse for all that. And tho' they had in many things greatly corrupted our Holy Religion, yet we ought not for that Reason intirely to cast it off. Our wise Predecessors, therefore being to Re-establish the Temple God, made choice of so much of the old Materials, as were sound and fit for the purpose, contenting themselves to throw away the Rubbish and the Rotten parts of the decay'd Building. And particularly as to the deriving our Orders from the Papists, we know, they,

The Preface.

they, who cast the Rubb in our way, have themselves had their pretended Orders from the Papists. From whom I pray can the first Lollards be imagin'd to have receiv'd Ordination but from the Papists? And from whom did the Presbyterian Priests receive theirs, but from the Papists or from us, who had ours from them? Briefly

Appendix to Jus
divinum Regimi-
nis Ecclesiastici p.
264.

ly the Presbyterians were of a different mind from these Objectors when they

had to deal with the Independents, as may be seen in the place quoted in the Margent. But Interest makes Men look two ways; and Design makes 'em to be of a double tongue.

FINIS.

C H A P. I.

Of the Government of the Church in general, and particularly of the Christian Church, till Schisms and Contentions arose, which happened in the Apostles days.

THE principal design of these Papers is to shew, that the Government of Churches was by the Apostles left in the Hands of single Persons presiding over the rest of the Elders and Ministers. In order whereunto let it be,

1. Observed that the Church of the *Jews*, which was the first establish'd in the World, that we know of, was govern'd by an High Priest as Supreme, by a second Order of Priests inferior unto him, and by Levites last of all. The Fathers frequently, and particularly *Clemens Romanus* seems to make this a President for the Government of Christian Churches by a Bishop Presbyters and Deacons, the first answering the High Priest, the second the inferior Priests and the third the Levites.

Clem. Ep. ad
Cor. Hieron. Ep.
ad Evangelium.

B

2. It

2. It is manifest that Jesus Christ, whilst on Earth modelled his little Flock according to this Pattern, himself being as it were the High Priest, the twelve Apostles his seconds, and the seventy Disciples still of a lower Rank and Order. How it was after Christ's Ascension is farther to be enquired into.

We do not read that Jesus Christ gave any express command in this matter, but seem'd rather to leave his Church in a state of Oligarchy, or in the power of Twelve, refusing as it were, or at least declining himself to appoint, which of the Twelve should be greatest or succeed him in the Govern-

ment; which to me is an unquestionable Argument, that they govern'd in a Parity. So that Christ having given no Orders therein (for neither did he commit the Power unto the Twelve themselves, but was wholly silent therein) it must then by order of Nature fall to the Apostles share, one would think, and so the Church had the face of an Aristocracy and not of a Populacy. For the Government had in Christ's life time been in their hands under Christ, and Christ had not appointed a single Successor; 'tis reasonable therefore to believe, that there it should remain after his Ascension into Heaven. It is yet more probable that Jesus Christ intended it should be so; because it was so necessary to fill the place of *Judas* the Apostate and complete the Twelve, which was the first Act of Government done in the Christian Church after

ter

ter Christ was Ascended, and unnecessary, if the Power had not been, nor was intended to remain in the Twelve.

The first motion for the ordaining a new Apostle was made by *Peter* in an Assembly of an 120 Disciples, *Acts* 1. 15. Then *they* (the 120 Disciples) (I suppose) *appointed two*, v. 23. And *they* (the Apostles I conceive) *Prayed*, v. 24. And *they* (still the Apostles I imagine) *gave forth the Lots*. So that the choice of the Persons to be presented unto the Apostles was made by the People. And one of the Persons so chosen was singled out by Prayer, and by Lots given forth by the Apostles; and perhaps solemnly ordained too after the competition was decided.

But because this Action seems not to be told so exactly, as might be wish'd, I will endeavour to explain it out of the next, which contains (as we find in *Acts* 6.) the choice Appointment and Ordination of the Seven Deacons. The Employment whereunto these Seven were first design'd was to distribute the publick Alms unto the Poor, which the Apostles before were wont to do: But now being taken up with much Business, and more important Complaints being made of some mistakes committed, the Apostles ordered the Multitude of Believers to *seek out Seven Men of good Report, whom they* (the Apostles) *might appoint over that business*. The Multitude did so, and presented them to the Apostles: The Apostles approving them, doubtless appointed

red them over that Business by Fasting and Prayer and laying on of hands (v. 6.) whereby also they became ordain'd to the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments. This I think is clear. 1. Because 'tis immediately noted that *the word of God increas'd and the number of Disciples multiplyed greatly, and that a great Company of the Priests were obedient to the Faith,* (v. 7.) 2. Because *Stephen* one of 'em did great Wonders and Miracles among the People by the Power (I conceive) which he received by the laying on of the Apostles Hands. For *none were able to resist the Wisdom and Spirit by which he spake,* (v. 10.) 3. Because *Philip* another of them is said afterwards upon the dispersion, to have *Preach'd the Word, Converted and Baptized many at Samaria* (Chap. 8.) 4. Because long after 'tis occasionally observed by *St Luke*, that *the rest* (of the Seven as I understand him) *Preach'd the Word in Phœnice, Cyprus, and at Antioch, &c.* at the same time or upon the Persecution that arose about *Acts. 11. 19.* *Stephen.* From all which I gather, that the Seven Deacons were ordained Ministers of the Word and Sacraments, as well as Dispensers of the publick Alms gathered at the Lord's Supper.

Let us now see what can be hence drawn for the better understanding the manner of the Ordination of the new Apostle before spoken of.

1. The Apostles commanded the People to *chuse Seven Men* (*Acts 6. 3.*) So *St. Peter* exhorted them to chuse one, as he seems to say (*Acts 1. 22.*) *Must one be Ordained.* 2. The

2. The People — ἡμεῖς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων
(Acts 6. 6.) *Set the Seven before the Apostles.* So
(Chap. 1. 23.) *they ἡμεῖς δύο (ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων)*
set two before the Apostles (not appointed two :)
For then it must have been κατίσχυς (Acts 6. 3.)
which was an Act of Apostolical Power) there-
fore the Apostles say ὡς καταστήμεθα, *whom we may*
Appoint, Acts 6. 3.

3. The Apostles prayed and laid their hands
on the Seven. (Chap. 6. 6) It was then the
Apostles that prayed and gave forth the Lot,
at the Election of *Matthias*, and ordained him
by Imposition of hands, as is reasonable to
think.

All the difference between these two Ordi-
nations (so I'll call 'em) was that in the first
the Apostles committed the Approbation of
Matthias unto Lots: In the second they made
use of their own power to approve, appoint,
and by Prayer and laying on of hands to or-
dain the Seven Deacons. But this is not to be
wonder'd at: For St. *Peter* mov'd for the choice
but of one, as has been said; but the People
chose two, being it should seem, divided in
their Judgments or Affections. The Apostles
therefore (to avoid giving any distaste to ei-
ther of the Candidates by any Act of prefe-
rence of one before the other, and perhaps to
cast off all the Odium that might thence arise,
or judging the Merits of both pretty equal,
and above all fearing a Division among the
Brethren might be occasioned, and one part of
the Disciples offended and disoblig'd, if they

should take upon 'em to determine which should be the Apostle) wholly declin'd themselves to pitch upon either, but rather chose to have the Controversie decided by Lots, that is, left it immediatly to be disposed on by God, and that especially because it was in so an extraordinary a case as this of ordaining an Apostle, which was fitter for God than for them to do. And all this is the more likely, because the Apostles themselves were not as yet invested with full power (Chap 1. 4, 8.) the Holy Ghost not being as yet fallen upon them. In short all this while we hear nothing of the Seventy Disciples of Christ, and what became of their Authority to Preach the Kingdom of God, is not said. 'Tis probable it ceased; only the Seven Deacons might be of them, as were *Justus* and *Matthias* according to the Ancients. As yet then there were but two orders that Preach'd the Word, Administer'd the Sacraments, and discharg'd such Acts of Power and Discipline as were necessary to the well-being and good Government of the Church; First Apostles, secondarily Deacons subordinate to 'em; which Deacons, as some think and I am apt to believe, were afterwards called Presbyters or Elders, as having the same power to minister in the Word and Sacraments as Elders had, of whom in the Christian Church first mention is made (*Acts* 11. 30.) But it will not follow that they were equal with the Apostles. Ordination at least must be excepted, as St. *Jerom* confess'd in comparing Presbyters

byters with Bishops. For that these Deacons (or Presbyters) could not ordain, is prov'd from the next Passage relating to Church-Government, *Acts* 8.

Upon the Persecution about *Stephen*, these seven Deacons were scattered abroad, and *Philip*, one of 'em, travell'd as far as *Samaria*, Preaching the Gospel, and Baptizing all that believed (vers. 12.) News hereof coming to the Apostles still abiding at *Jerusalem*, they sent *Peter* and *John* thither, who by Prayer (vers. 15.) and laying on of hands (vers. 17.) conferr'd the Holy Ghost upon some of 'em; perhaps (as Mr. *Pryn*n himself acknowledg'd, || *Timothy* Unordain'd 'em. So the giving of bishop'd, p. 2. the Holy Ghost may justly be understood. And be sure they did something which *Philip* could not; and for which they were sent thither. Some may, and with Reason, believe it Confirmation. I'll take *Pryn*n at his word, and suppose that *Peter* and *John* ordain'd 'em. The Government of the Church therefore, and Ordination, was lodg'd in the Apostles only, or as Supreme: for *Philip* ordain'd 'em not, laid not his hands upon them, no not with the Apostles; though he had the Power of dispensing the Word and Sacraments, yet not of ordaining. This will farther appear from *Simon Magus*, in the Story following: He seeing that through the laying on of hands of the Apostles the Holy Ghost was given, (ver. 18.) that is, as Mr. *Pryn*n thinks,

and I'll suppose, Ordination and Power to preach the Word and minister the Sacrament with Efficacy and Success, ask'd *Peter* and *John* to give him also that Power (vers. 19.) What Power? not the Power of a Deacon (or Presbyter) to labour in the Word and Doctrine, and to administer the Holy Sacraments; but the Power of conferring that Power, viz. that on whomsoever he laid his hands, he might receive the Holy Ghost, v. 19. or, according to the present Hypothesis, be ordain'd to the Ministry, which was the work for which the Holy Ghost was given, as I suppose is not improbable.

'Tis no doubt therefore with me, but that there was a manifest Distinction between the Apostles and other inferiour Ministers. The Apostles Power of Preaching and Ministering the Sacraments, was common, and the same with that of the Deacons; but over and above, they had the sole Power of Ordaining others unto that Work: for *Philip* had it not. Every one therefore who is ordain'd to the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, has not a Right and Authority to ordain others unto the same Ministry.

The next Ordination, as 'tis also reckon'd by Mr. *Frynn*, is recorded *Acts* 9. 17. where it is said, that *Ananias* laid his hands upon *Saul*. True, it was partly to confer upon him the Recovery of his Blindness; but it might be also to ordain him: For, 1. This seems to have been the Design of God him-
self

self, when he tells *Ananias* (vers. 15.) *He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles.* Besides, 2. *Ananias* tells *Paul*, that *he was commanded of God to lay hands on him, not only that Saul might receive his sight, but that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost,* (vers. 17.) Whereupon it is 3. added, that *Saul straightway preached Christ in the Synagogues, that he was the son of God,* (vers. 22.) Let then this pass for granted, that *Ananias* ordain'd *Paul*; but at the same time consider, 1. That *Ananias* was no sort of Church-Officer or Minister; he was but a private Believer or Disciple, for any thing we know (vers. 10.) 2. Whatever it was that he did unto *Saul* (suppose he ordain'd him) it was done by a special and exprefs Command from *Jesus Christ*, in a Vision (vers. 10.) 3. He was a single Person, no other being joyn'd with him at the laying on of hands. 4. It was done privately, and in *Saul's* Chamber, where he lay blind. There was not so much as a Witness of the Action, at least no believing Christian Witness. For all which Reasons, I reckon this is no sufficient Direction about Ordination in succeeding Ages. If it were, then 1. Any single Person might ordain whomsoever he thought fit. 2. Any Believer, himself being not ordain'd, but only a Christian Disciple, might ordain. 3. Ministers might be ordain'd in private, without the Knowledge and Consent of the Church. In short, *Ananias* had no Liberty nor discretionary

tionary Power in doing this. It was the Command of God. The Person ordaining was appointed to ordain: the Person ordained was nominated by God. So that *Ananias* ordain'd *Paul* by Propheſie or Revelation; that is, by an immediate and extraordinary Commiſſion from God. It therefore can be no Rule or Preſident for us, except the Power of Ordination ſhall be granted unto every ſingle Believer in his private Chamber, to lay his hands on whomſoever he pleaſes.

There is another Ordination we read of like unto this: 'Tis in *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. *Now there were at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers, and the Holy Ghoſt ſaid unto them, ſeparate me Barnabas and Saul, &c.* The Perſons here ſpoken of were *Teachers*, that is, ordinary Miniſters, generally ſpeaking; but call'd *Prophets* becauſe they received this ſpecial Command from Chriſt by the Holy Ghoſt to advance *Barnabas* and *Saul* to the Apoſtleſhip of the Gentiles: As alſo they might perhaps have receiv'd Revelations at other times and upon other Occaſions. Here it will not be amiſs to ſhew the Difference between an Apoſtle and a Chriſtian Prophet.

Apoſtles were the firſt and ſupreme Rank of Church-Officers; Prophets were next to them, *1 Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11. They were both aſſiſted and guided by the extraordinary Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, yet with this difference, The Authority of the Apoſtles was fixt and habitual, their Character indelible,
and

and their Office perpetual: They expected not special Directions from God at every turn, but for the most part acted as it were according to their own Discretion: yet I suppose in Matters of Importance, and in Doctrines essential, guided by the Spirit. The Prophets Power was not constant nor discretionary: they acted only what, and when God gave them special Orders, by Vision and Revelation. Thus in the Jewish Church, the Priests Authority was inherent and unalterable. The Prophets said and did only what the Spirit now and then determined them unto: They spake only as, and when the Spirit mov'd 'em in an extraordinary manner, which if the Spirit ceas'd to do, they were no longer Prophets. Thus the Teachers here at *Antioch* (ordinary Ministers, and under the Apostles, yet) being mov'd by the Holy Ghost, became Prophets, and ordained *Barnabas* and *Saul*: for so they were commanded, and so was *Ananias* commanded to lay hands on *Saul*: But the Apostles were not so specially commanded when they ordained the seven Deacons. In a word, the seven Deacons were call'd and chosen by the Church or People, but *Saul* was chosen and call'd of God, though both he and they were ordain'd by Men; they by the standing, I may call it the ordinary Power of the Apostles; but *Saul* by a special and extraordinary Commission given unto the Prophets. The Apostles ordaining the seven Deacons I take therefore
to

to be our Rule at this day: *Barnabas* and *Saul's* Ordination belongs not unto us, except there arose any Prophets among us.

I pass hence then unto that Ordination which is mention'd *Acts 14. 23.* And when they, *Barnabas* and *Paul*, had ordain'd Elders in every Church, &c. These Words comprehend many Ordinations had in very many Provinces, and the Cities belonging to 'em very distant and remote from one another. Herein *Paul* and *Barnabas* acted not by Prophecy or Revelation, but by the Apostolical Authority, wherewith they had been intrusted. And these Ordinations I take to be Presidents unto us. If any one shall tell me, that other ordinary Ministers joined with the two Apostles in these Ordinations, I shall desire to have it prov'd by any Circumstance in this Story, or any clear and good Example drawn from any other place of Scripture: although if it were so, it serves not the Presbyterians Cause, but exactly agrees with Ordination by Bishops and Presbyters.

It will perhaps be said, that as yet there being no Elders in any of those Cities, it was then no wonder the two Apostles alone should ordain without ordinary Ministers with them. That no Stress ought to be laid on such Instances, in as much as *Barnabas* and *Paul* were constrain'd thereunto by necessity, and that at other times the Presbyters and Elders ordain'd; to which purpose *1 Tim. 4. 14.* is commonly alledged; and indeed 'tis the
only

only place that can with any colour be insisted on by the Presbyterians. I shall have occasion to examine this place hereafter: In the mean while I say, that this was not the Reason: For then *Philip* would have laid hands on those that were ordain'd at *Samaria*, as well as *Peter* and *John*; and *Simon* might have demanded of *Philip* the Power of giving the Holy Ghost, as well as of the Apostles. And it is observable, that *Philip* had the Holy Ghost himself, and that he wrought Miracles (*Acts* 5.13.) but did not confer the Gift to others. Here it is said, that *Simon Magus* continu'd with *Philip*, wondering and beholding the Miracles and Signs that were done, and doubtless would have ask'd *Philip* as he after ask'd *Peter* and *John*, to give him the Power of giving the Holy Ghost, but that he knew very well, that *Philip* had not Power to confer that Power. Let then the Gift of the Holy Ghost here spoken of be what it will, *Philip* had it, but could not give it. 'Tis then reasonable hence to collect, that every one that has any Gift has not Power to confer it, and that all that are ordain'd to the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, cannot themselves ordain. As yet then, the Power of Ordaining was in the hands of the Apostles only.

The next Act of Church-Government that we read of, is in *Acts* 15. where the Question arose, whether Gentile-Believers were oblig'd to be circumcis'd. The Controversie was started

started at *Antioch*, and thence sent unto the *Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem* (vers. 2.) to be consider'd of, and was there determin'd in the Negative. *Paul and Barnabas* carry'd the Message, who were kindly received of the Church of the *Apostles and Elders* (v. 4.) Then the *Apostles and Elders* came together to consider of this matter (v. 6.) The Decrees being made, it pleased the *Apostles and Elders* with the whole Church to send 'em to *Antioch* (vers. 22.) together with Letters beginning thus; *The Apostles and Elders and Brethren* send greeting (vers. 23.) Moreover *Paul* afterwards visiting the Churches which he had formerly planted, deliver'd 'em the Decrees that were ordain'd of the *Apostles and Elders* (ch. 16. v. 4.) From all which it may be observ'd,

1. That Elders have a share in the deliberative and legislative part of Church-Government. The Question was sent to the *Apostles and Elders*. *The Apostles and Elders* consider'd of this matter; the Decrees were made by the *Apostles and Elders*: But in what things the Elders have the Executive Power, whether in all or in some particularly; whether they can Ordain with or without a superiour Officer over them, does not here appear.

2. That *St. Luke* seems very careful and exact, as he tells the Story, to give precedence into the *Apostles* as being Superior to the Elders. Thus the words constantly run—— *the Apostles and Elders*.

3. That

3. That this is the best, I think the only Card the Presbyterians have to play in defence of their way of Government, which nevertheless if well look'd into, overthrows it. For the Elders were subordinate to the Apostles; that I hope will not be deny'd me. For all were not Apostles, but under them were Pastors and Teachers. The Churches then were not govern'd by Officers in a Parity, but by Apostles and Elders under them. The Presbyterians must allow that there is a force in this Observation, and that the Elders at *Jerusalem* were not the Apostles Peers, or else they will be oblig'd to grant the People also an equal share with themselves in Church Government.

1 Cor. 12. 28, 29.

Eph. 4. 11.

For if from hence they will pretend to assert their right to ordain, because they sat in Council with the Apostles at *Jerusalem* and join'd in making the Decrees and other Conclusions, it will by the same Reasoning follow, that the People (who sent the Decrees to other Churches, as well as the Elders did (v. 22. 23.) for to be observ'd, and in whose name the commanding Stile of the Letters, which enjoyn'd the Observation of those Decrees ran, as well as in the name of the Elders) have therefore a Right to lay on hands and to ordain Elders also. In a word then, the transactions of this Council will do the *Presbyterians as much hurt as good, yea will do 'em no service at all. The summ of the whole matter is, that the Apostles were the chief

chief in the deliberative and legislative part of Church Government, and for ought any thing appears here, or can be hence collected, had the sole power of Ordination still.

We have no farther account in Scripture, whether the Apostles Govern'd the Church in

Apollonius, and from him *Euseb.* l. 5. c. 18. and *Bede* say they separated 12 years after Christ's Ascension, which will fall 6 years sooner. See *Vales.* in cap. 16. lib. 2. *Euseb.* and *Patriop Pearson* Lect. in Act. Apost. who adds the testimony of *Clement Alexand.* and the Apocryphal book of *Peter's* Preaching.

one collective body afterwards, nor how long * they continued together. 'Tis most likely they shortly after dispers'd themselves throughout the World to preach the Gospel: For so it was commanded them. (*Acts* 1. 8.) Besides we find not any mention of the Apostles at *Jerusalem* or elsewhere, when *Paul* went thither afterwards, (*Acts* 21.) For *James* was not the Apostle, but Brother of Christ. *St. Luke* could not miss taking notice of some of 'em at least, had they then resided in that City. Briefly they are none of 'em mention'd any more in the Word of God where they were, except that *Peter* (*1. Ep.* 5. 13.) was at *Babylon*, and *John* (*Rev.* 1. 19.) in the Isle of *Patmos*. Let us then trace the History of Church Government in the person of *Paul* the Apostle. Immediately after *Paul* and *Barnabas* had deliver'd the Decrees of the Council held at *Jerusalem* unto the Church of *Antioch*, they fell out and separated. *Paul* having after this Preach'd the Gospel in several

ral Countries and Cities with great success, at length came to *Ephesus*, where he laid his hands upon twelve men, on whom the Holy Ghost came, and they spake with tongues and prophesied (*Acts* 19. 6, 7.) Mr. Prynne acknowledges this an Ordination, and with some probability it may be thought they were the *Ephesian* Elders, which afterwards met Paul at *Miletus*. The Ordination is attributed to Paul only; 'twas he that laid his hands on them. Now *Timothy* and *Erastus* (*Acts* 19.22.) were with Paul at this time, and who else is not said; but they laid not their hands on those twelve men with Paul.

To proceed then. In the *1 Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. St. Paul gives the *Corinthian* Elders Order to Excommunicate the Incestuous Person; and thus it runs, — *I verily as absent in body but present in spirit have judged (have decreed) as though I were present (personally) concerning him that has so done this deed: In the name (or Authority) of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together and of my spirit (that is, by my Authority) with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan.* 'Twas Paul then who decreed the Excommunication, and commanded the *Corinthian* Elders, in his Absence, to confirm and publish it. The same Apostle excommunicated *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* (*1 Tim.* 1. 20.) 'Twas Paul who gave Sentence against these evil Doers, no Elder of *Corinth* or of *Ephesus* joyning with him. Briefly, the Apostle had

C

the

the Care of all the Churches, 2 Cor. 11. 28. not of all the Churches in the World, but of all that he himself, with so much Labour and Hazard, had planted and watered. Lastly, it was *Paul's* particular Aim, in those Epistles to the *Corinthians*, to assert his own single Authority over them, and over the resident Ministers of that Church, his Fellow-Labourers, as were easie to make out.

Of *Paul's* Charge to the *Ephesian* Elders I shall speak when I treat particularly of that Church.

I go on therefore to *Timothy's* Ordination: For though I will assert and prove, that he was Bishop of *Ephesus*; yet was he possibly ordain'd before that, and in some other place. *St. Paul* ordain'd *Timothy*, 2 Epist. 1. 6. *Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by putting on of my hands.* This place is incontestable, proving that *Timothy* was ordain'd by *Paul*, without Elders mention'd. But the other place, 1 Epist. 4. 14. is thought to be as much on the Presbyterian side. The Words are these, — *the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* This latter Passage the Presbyterians assume as the great Charter and Support of their Cause and Right to ordain. But the Mischief is, they seldom take notice of the former; and Mr. *Pryn*, their mighty Champion, passes it over in silence. I on the contrary will examine, whether it makes any thing for them, or against us. For I am unwilling

willing to deal in this case as Mr. *Pryn* has done; that is, I will not overlook what is or seems to be against us: That little Artifice becomes not one that sincerely employs himself in the Search of Truth, how allowable soever it may be thought in a Barrister, who only pretends (right or wrong) to make the best of his Client's Cause. His Client's Interest and Money speaks loudly on one side, but stops the Lawyer's mouth on the other. Thus Mr. *Pryn*, in Conformity to his own Profession, has slip'd over our Evidence; but I'll examine his with all the Strictness and Severity I am able. My Endeavour shall be to shew, that the 1 *Epist.* 4. 14. makes little or nothing for Presbyterian Ordination, and to reconcile it with ours, and its Parallel 2 *Ep.* 1. 6. To this end I'll enquire, 1. Whether those mentioned in the Epistles to *Timothy* were two several Ordinations, or whether *Timothy* was ordain'd twice. 2. What the Meaning of *ἐπισκοπῆς*, *Prophecy* is. 3. What is to be understood by *ἐπισκοπῆς*, *Presbytery*. 4. I will consider *Paul's* varying his way of expressing himself *ἀπὸ* by Prophecy, and *μετὰ* with the laying on of the Presbytery's hands.

1. Whether they were two distinct Ordinations, or whether *Timothy* was ordained twice.

It is no doubt with me, but that they were two Ordinations, and that 1. because St. *Paul* himself over and above his being called to the Ministry of the Gospel not by *Men* but

by God; yet was he ordained twice by Men, as has already been observ'd. The like may reasonably be supposed of *Timothy*, who tho there went Prophecies on him, yet was he ordain'd twice, of both which *St. Paul* in these Epistles to him makes mention. For 2. I do not well imagine why the Apostle mentions one and the same Ordination twice, nor why he represents one and the same after so different a manner. *Timothy* must then needs have been ordain'd twice. And if this be so, we must say, that the first time he was ordain'd Presbyter by Prophecy with the Presbytery; the second by the laying on of *St. Paul's* hands. Hence then I gather, That as *St. Paul* was first ordain'd to be only a Minister of the Word in ordinary, but afterwards ordain'd a second time unto the Apostleship of the Gentiles, to an higher Office and Degree in the Church; so was *Timothy* first made a Presbyter, and then the Supreme Guide, or Bishop, of the *Ephesian* Church.

But I foresee this will not be granted me, therefore do add, that if *Timothy* underwent Imposition of Hands but once, then *Paul* must be granted to have been the principal † Man in it; the Presbytery joining with him: and the Presbyterians will be oblig'd to reconcile their Practice

† Mr. Calvin seems to confess this — It does not plainly appear whether when any one

was ordain'd, all were wont to lay Hands on his Head, or whether one only, in the Place and Name of all the rest. *Calv. in 2 Tim. 1. 6.*

here—

herewith, and to shew an Agreement between the two Passages now under Examination, which I believe they will never be able to do, although I promise to do it before I dismiss the present Argument.

Let us now, 2. Examine the Meaning of *verbalis* in this place. It cannot be question'd but that there were some Intimations given extraordinarily by God for ordaining *Timothy*, which are here call'd Prophecies, and which are spoken of *1 Tim. 1. 18.* — *this charge I commit unto thee Son Timothy, according to the Prophecies that went before of thee.* Most certainly then, God manifested his Will for the ordaining of *Timothy* by some special Revelation: for as *Paul* himself (after God had said *Acts 9. 15, 16.* — *He is a chosen vessel to bear my name — And I will shew him what great things he must suffer for my name* (which words are Prophetical) was ordain'd by *Ananias*; so doubtless, *Timothy* (God having first appointed it and foretold he must war a good warfare, *1 Tim. 1. 18.*) was ordain'd by some Prophets or other, according to these Prophecies; as also *Paul* committed the charge unto him accordingly. Prophecy then here *1 Tim. 4. 14.* signifies Prophets or Persons ordaining *Timothy* according to those Prophecies, the Abstract put for the Concrete, even as Presbytery is put for Presbyters, as is agreed on all hands. For as the Charge which *Paul* committed to *Timothy* (*1 Epist. 1. 18.*) was not committed properly by Pro-

phesy, but by *Paul* according to the *Prophecies* given of him, or pursuant thereto; so did he receive the Ministerial Gift not properly by *Prophecy* in the Abstract, but by *Prophets* in the Concrete, according to the Revelations given to them, unto whom the Word of the Lord came. Now those who received those Intimations from God concerning *Timothy*, may justly be esteemed *Prophets*, even as they who ordained *Paul* (*Acts* 13. 1.) are call'd. If it be demanded of me, who were those *Prophets* unto whom the Intimations of *Timothy's* Ordination were reveal'd, and who accordingly ordain'd him, the Resolution is easie. *St. Paul*, doubtless, was one, and the chief. I say this only upon Supposition, *Timothy* was but once ordain'd. He is call'd a Prophet, *Acts* 13. 1. and in the other place it is said, that *Timothy* was ordain'd by him, *2 Tim.* 1. 6. Another Prophet, if there were more than one, was *Silas*: He is stil'd Prophet, *Acts* 15. 32. and was *Paul's* Companion before *Timothy* was (vers. 40.) and continu'd with *Paul* after that, as we read Chap. 16. 25. Chap. 17. 15. Chap. 18. 5. 'Tis then highly reasonable to believe, that *Paul* and *Silas*, *Prophets*, did ordain *Timothy* according to the *Prophecies* that were given before of him. I add, the *Presbytery* here mentioned, or *Presbyters* themselves, might have been *Prophets* too, and ordain'd *Timothy*, according to *Prophecy*. — Nor let any one wonder that I advance an Order in the Christian Church

Church call'd Prophets. St. Paul has done it to my hands in his Epistles to the *Corinthians* and *Ephesians*, 1 Cor. 12. 28. — *First Apostles, secondarily Prophets, &c. v. 29.* — *Are all Apostles, are all Prophets?* See ch. 14. So Eph. 4. 11. — *and he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets.* The same appears, Eph. 2. 20. *and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets;* that he here meant Prophets then in the Christian Church appears from Eph. 3. 5. — *which in other Ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men, as it is now reveal'd unto his holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit.* To dispatch this point; Apostles doubtless were sometimes called Prophets, but Prophets were not Apostles *quâ tales*. For then they had been convertible, and not two different Ranks of Church Officers. We see then, that *Timothy* was ordain'd, or might have been by *Paul* and *Silas* and the Presbyters, all Prophets or acting according to the Prophecies that were before of him.

3. Let us now see what we are to understand by Presbytery. 'Tis a word borrowed from the *Jewish Church*. *Moses* took the Heads of the Twelve Tribes to be assistant to him in the Government. Unto these answered the Twelve Apostles: But at length God commanded him to chuse Seventy Elders of the People, Numb. 11. 16. *Who might take part of the burden, and Moses not bear it alone.* These Seventy (or Seventy two) sc. six out of every Tribe made up the celebrated Council call'd

C 4 by

by the Jews in their own Language the Sanedrin; but in the New Testament and the Greek Tongue *ἐπισβυτήριον* or *συμβούριον*, as appears from *Acts 22. 5.*—*As the High Priest* (says Paul) *witnesseth for me and all the estate of the Elders:* 'tis in the Original *Presbytery*, and v. 30th. is call'd *ἐκκλησίαν τῶν συμβούλων αὐτῶν* *their whole Council* i. e. the High Priests Council, which must imply that the High Priests were part and the heads of it; why else is it call'd *their Council*? In the 66. v. of 22. of St.

† Moreover, whereas it is said *Act. 22. 5.* that Paul receiv'd Letters from the Estate of the Elders: the High Priest mentioned just before must likewise be understood, from whom also Paul receiv'd those Letters *Act. 9. v. 2.*

Luke's Gospel we have it thus--*and the Elders of the People and the chief Priests, &c.* 'Tis in the abstract the *Presbytery*, not the Elders of the People: St. Mark thus expresseth it ch. 15. v. 1.--*and straight way in the morning the chief Priests with (or and) the Elders and the Scribes and the whole Council* *ἑκκλησίαν* or *Presbytery* holding a Consult to condemn Jesus, &c. Now in this Council or *Presbytery* it cannot be question'd, but that the High Priest was Supreme and part of the Council, or Sanedrin, or *Presbytery*, as well as the Elders and Scribes and the rest of the Council; even as Moses also was head and a part of his Council of Seventy. Yea Christ himself, who was also a Prophet like unto Moses, had Twelve Apostles (and Seventy Disciples) who made up

up a Presbytery * as it were. But Christ was the Head, and so a Member of 'em. So likewise every Apostle in his Plantation had his Presbytery in the Cities, where he had settled Churches (as is clear from the Church of *Jerusalem* (*Act. 15.*) but that Apostle was Head of them. Unto what City or Place the Presbytery here spoken of (*1 Tim. 4. 14.*) belong'd, is not said; but questionleis to some of those Churches establish'd by *Paul*, and doubtless *Paul* was head of it, and if so, *Timothy* was and may be granted to have been Ordained by the Presbytery, of which *Paul* was the Principal and Head. Will any one dispute whether *Paul* was chief Governour of the Church of *Ephesus* and over the Presbyters? 'Tis not to be doubted of: And that every Apostle was so in the Churches is not to be controverted. Taking it then for granted, that every Apostle, as well as *St. Paul*, was part of the Presbytery and head thereof, you have a good account why *St. John* calls himself *πρεσβύτερος*, *2 Ep. 1. 3. Ep. 1.* and much more why *St. Peter* styles himself *συμπρεσβύτερος* a fellow Presbyter. But what? does calling themselves Presbyters strip 'em of their Apostolical and Supreme Authority in their Presbyteries? By no means: For *St. Peter* prefaces his Epistles thus — *An Apostle of Jesus Christ*. And therefore him who in modesty and condescension call'd himself a fellow Presbyter,

Presbyter, we ought in justice to acknowledge him Arch-Presbyter. Nor is it to be wonder'd at, that the Apostles though Supreme are call'd Presbyters. For even the Levitical High Priests

Numb. 16. 10.

Deut. 12. 1.

Nehem. 9. 34.

Psal. 99. 6. 132.

9. 16.

are styl'd by the ordinary and simple names of Priests, and the High Priesthood is frequently if not always styl'd the Priesthood: Yea and our Lord himself, who without all Controversie is our High-Priest, is sometimes call'd Priest, *Heb.* 7. 11. 15, 21. *Psal.* 110. 4. which does not diminish the Honour and Power of his High-Priesthood; still he's Head of his Church and *High-Priest of our Profession*. However this be, 'tis a very common way for Persons to take up with less honorable Titles, than what justly they might claim, and at least themselves out of humility to degrade themselves: So Christ is named-- *the Shepherd and Bishop of our Souls*, 1 Pet. 2. 25. yea he said he was his Disciple, *Deacon*, Minister, or Servant: Even at this day we name Presbyters Ministers, that is, in the Greek Language Deacons. Nay our Bishops themselves are so call'd, as may be seen in the Collect at their Consecration--- *Almighty God, who by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers, mercifully behold this thy Servant now call'd to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop*. All this notwithstanding, as the Levitical High-Priests were above the Ordinary or Secondary Priests, and as Christ was Lord and Master of his Disciples, and is the High-

High-Priest under the Gospel; so *Peter* and *John* were Apostles above the Presbyters, and the Presbyters were Elders above Deacons, *Phil. 1. 1.* Upon the whole matter then it is clear to me, that the Presbytery spoken of *1 Tim. 4. 14.* includes the Apostle *Paul*; who was a Presbyter or fellow Presbyter and Arch-presbyter among 'em, who therefore was a Member and part of the Presbytery, and yet the Head and Government or Apostle of it at the same time.

Nor is it to be wonder'd that an Apostle or Prophet superior to, and a distinct Order from Presbyters, should yet be comprehended in the word Presbytery. We have an example among our selves which will reconcile this readily to our Imaginations.

The word Parliament in strictness signifies the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, and their joynt Votes are call'd Votes of Parliament, and we oft say the King and Parliament. Now these expressions do imply that the King's Majesty is not of the Parliament; and yet the Acts which have pass both Houses are not Acts of Parliament 'till the King has made 'em such: For they are in truth the Acts of the King as well as of the Parliament, and so we mean, though we only call 'em Acts of Parliament, which yet they are not without the King. Thus, the Ordination of *Timothy* may be call'd the Act of the Presbytery, altho' it were the Act of *Paul* also, without whom it would not have been valid. So that *Paul* seems

to

to me to have observed great care and exactness in saying *Timothy* was Ordained by the *Presbytery* in the Abstract, not by *Presbyters* in the Concrete. For as it is not true to affirm that such or such a Law was made by the Lords and Commons (for they alone cannot make Laws.) So it would not have been true to have ascribed *Timothy's* Ordination to the *Presbyters*, though it be true that he was ordain'd by the *Presbytery*, which includes *Paul* also the Head of it. For as Lords and Commons only mention'd seem to exclude the King, so *Presbyters* if only named would have excluded *Paul*. But *Presbytery* does include him as the expression *Act of Parliament* does the King. In two words, it is most reasonable to comprehend *Paul* in the *Presbytery*, if we will not include him in the abstract Prophecie.

4. I will now consider *Paul's* different way of expressing himself thus *διὰ προφητείας καὶ ἐνδοξασίας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν ἐπιτάξει τῶν ἀποστόλων*, & *διὰ ἐνδοξασίας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἐν ἐπιτάξει τῶν ἀποστόλων* by Prophecy, by the laying on of my hands, with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*. Any one observing this change of Prepositions would suspect something in it, and from the premises conclude, that *Timothy* was properly ordained by Prophets, who were

The conjecture of Calvin before mention'd seems to favour this interpretation.

commanded so to do, or that the Prophets were the Instruments under God of conferring the gift upon *Timothy* in the presence or witness, and with the consent of the *Presbyters*.

The

The late Dr. Owen laid a great deal of stress on this Criticism in that Controversie about Justification. He observ'd that in Scripture we are ever said to be justify'd *διὰ πίστεως* (or *πίστει* and *ἐν πίστει* which are the same) by Faith, never by good Works, although good Works always accompany and bear witness unto true Faith. So that according to this Gentleman, it must be confest, that as we are justify'd by Faith *with* good Works, so was *Timothy* ordain'd by Prophets and by Paul *with* the Presbyters: that as Faith is the effectual Instrument where-by Justification is convey'd, and good Works where-with it is conferr'd; so were Paul and the Prophets such, by whom the Gift was bestowed on *Timothy*, but the Presbyters *with* whom it was given. In short, that the Presbyters contributed thereunto no more, than good Works in the Doctor's Opinion do unto Justification, that is, nothing at all. I am so far, I own, of the Doctor's Mind, that in Justification Faith is the first and chiefest Instrument of Conveyance, and consequently that in *Timothy's* Ordination Paul and the Prophets were so according to the Argument built upon this Criticism. In earnest, I do think that the change of the Prepositions (especially in one and the same period, when he might as easily have said, *ἐν πίστει καὶ ἔργῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, and by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery) does at least import a preference. The like hereunto is to be met with *Mark 15. 1.* — the chief

chief Priests with the Elders holding a Council. It will not be deny'd tho the Elders were part of this Assembly, yet the Chief-Priests were supreme; and for that Reason 'tis express'd — *with the Elders.* In like manner (*Acts 15. 22.*) *It seem'd good to the Apostles and Elders, with the Church;* by Church meaning the whole Body of the believing Brethren then present, as distinguish'd from the Apostles and Elders. But no one will say that the Multitude of Believers were equal in Authority to the Apostles, and therefore is put after them with a *with.* But it will be said St. Paul does the quite contrary (*Philip. 1. 1.*) — *Paul and Timotheus the Servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons.* The Answer is easie, viz. 1. That the subject-matter of this Epistle concerns not Acts of Authority, wherein Order is strictly to be observ'd, but of Piety and Religion, which is common to all, wherein one is not concern'd more than another. There was then no need of Paul's being curious and exact. And the Apostle put the Saints first *with the Bishops, &c.* the rather because, 2. The Epistle concern'd not the Bishops and Deacons, except as Christians, but was inscrib'd to the Saints principally, yea only. Nor was there any need to mention the Bishops at all. But the Apostle did it by the by, only in Honour to them. Besides, in familiar private Letters Men write their Mind *pro re natâ*, and as it happens,

happens, without Order or Method, unless as in the Case before us, they have occasion to speak of some Acts of Power and Authority, as the Apostle treats here of *Timothy's* Ordination, and By whom, *viz. by the Prophets* and *by Paul with the Presbytery*. The Order he observes, and the Change of the Preposition, I am perswaded argue that *Timothy* was ordain'd not by a Company of Presbyters in equal Power among themselves, but by a superiour Order of Church-Officers or Prophets, *with the Presbyters* consenting and joining.

One word more, and I shall conclude this Grammatical Strife: That *μετ' with* signifies or intimates something less than *διὰ by*, may be argu'd from *Acts* 14. 27. — *all that God had done with them*. It must be confess'd, that *μετ' with* in this place, is *διὰ by* in the sense of it, and ought to have been so render'd. But then let the words be turn'd into the Passive, and thus they should run, *ἡμεῖς ἐμελίσθημεν διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μετ' αὐτῶν*, *all that was done by God with them*. Now no one will presume to say, but that the Conversions here spoken of are principally to be attributed unto God, the Apostles labouring with and under him; even as we understand that *Timothy* was ordain'd *by Paul*, and by the Prophets, the Presbyters laying on hands *with them*.

By the way, I will here take the Liberty to explain some passages in Scripture concerning *St. Paul's* Ordination, and reconcile 'em
with

with some others that seem to overthrow it; and this is the more necessary to be done, because many material things in the precedent Discourse will depend upon the proof of this one, That *Paul* was ordain'd by Men; the contrary whereof may seem probable from many Testimonies of Scripture now to be produc'd and answer'd.

The Apostle *St. Paul* says (*1 Cor. 15. 10.*) that *χαρις* (or *διὰ χάριτος*, which is the same with *Dr. Owen*) *by the grace of God*

Rom. 1. 5.

1 Cor. 1. 1.

2 Cor. 1. 1.

Gal. 1. 1.

Eph. 1. 1.

Col. 1. 1.

2 Tim. 1. 1.

I am what I am; that is, an Apostle, *vers. 9.* The like way of speaking he uses frequently, as in the places quoted in the Margin: Of all which, that's most remarkable, *1 Gal. 1.* — *Paul an Apostle not of men, neither by man, but by*

Jesus Christ: From whence it may be thought that he never was ordain'd by Men, or receiv'd the Apostleship from them. The Answer hereunto I ground upon *1 Tim. 1. 1.*

— *Paul an Apostle by the commandment of God our Saviour.* It ought to have been render'd, *according to the commandment of God*, as it is more correctly translated *Tit. 1. 3.* In the Greek it is *κατὰ ἐντολὴν*, *according to the Commandment*, that is, the immediate and special Direction and Nomination of God. For whereas most commonly those that were ordain'd were chosen by Men governing themselves according to Prudence and Discretion. But *Paul* was not so chosen; but instead of being

being chosen by Men, the Lord Jesus Christ pointed him out, and commanded him to be ordain'd. Thus he was an Apostle *not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ*. Nevertheless, he was ordain'd solemnly by the Imposition of hands, *Acts 13. 3.* and therefore he tells *Titus* and *Timothy*, that he was an Apostle *according to the Commandment of God*, viz. he was ordain'd an Apostle *by Men according to the Commandment*. For so it was even in the Case of *Timothy* himself. He was ordain'd *not essential* by Prophecy; God by Revelation appointed him; but he was solemnly ordain'd by Paul *with the Presbytery, according to the Prophecies* that went of him: So *Paul* expresseth himself about his constituting or confirming *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus* (*1 Tim. 1. 18.*) — *This charge I commit unto thee according to the prophecies.* In short, if one would speak accurately, thus it ought to be said, that *Paul* was called (*1 Rom. 1.*) and *1 Cor. 1. 1.*) or chosen and appointed by the extraordinary Commandment of Jesus Christ to be an Apostle, but he was ordained thereunto *by Men, according to that Commandment*; whereas all others that we read of (*Barnabas, Timothy*, and the Twelve Apostles, excepted) were both call'd, and chosen, and ordain'd by Men, according to the standing Rule and Law of the Church.

The Sum of what has been said is, in fewer Words, 1. That if by Prophecy we understand Prophets in the Concrete, then was *Timothy*
D ordain'd

ordain'd by an extraordinary Order of Church-Officers superior unto Presbyters, and not only by a College of Presbyters, in a Parity; and if the Apostle *Paul* was one of those Prophets (as is reasonable to think) then was *Timothy* ordain'd by the Apostle as supreme with the Presbyters. Therefore according to this Interpretation, *Timothy* was not ordain'd by ordinary Presbyters in a Parity. The Presbyterian Argument hence drawn, is out of doors. But if

2. This shall not be allowed as the true Sense of the place, but Prophecy must be taken in the abstract, and *Timothy* must have been ordain'd, by Prophecy, as *Paul* was an Apostle, *ὡς Ἰωάννης ὁ ἱεροῦ χεῖρ* (*Eph. 1. 1.*) by the will of God, then we must pitch upon some Persons unto whom the Prophecy of *Timothy* came, and who were commanded thereby to Ordain *Timothy*. To make short work of it, I will suppose it the Presbytery (and this I am sure, will please our Presbyterians) I mean the Assembly of the Presbyters met together. But even thus it must be suppos'd that *Paul* was among 'em and in that Presbytery then assembled. For how else could *Paul* say—*which* (gift) *is in thee by the putting on of my hands.* (*2 Epist. 1. 6.*) Unless the Presbyterians will allow, as I dare say they will not, that *Timothy* was ordain'd twice. And thus also Ordination by Presbyters in a Parity without a Superior Church Officer over them, falls to the ground. But

3. If

3. If it be deny'd that *Paul* was among the Presbyters when the Word of the Lord concerning *Timothy* came unto 'em, then they ordain'd *Timothy* not by Virtue of their Eldership, but by the special Will and Commandment of God; in which case, any Man may ordain any Person thus prophesied of in any private place whatever. Here then is no Warrant for the Presbyterian Ordinations now at this day among us, unless they will be Prophets as well as Elders.

4. If it be deny'd that *Paul* was among the Presbyters, then *Timothy* must have been ordained a second time, viz. by
 2 *Epist.* 1. 6. *the putting on of his hands.* And thus they will be forc'd to acknowledge *Timothy* something more than a Presbyter; and what that can be but a Governor of the Church, Superior to the Ordinary Elders, I know not: For I take it for granted, they'll not say he was ordain'd a Presbyter over again by *Paul*. Have a care of that.

5. And to conclude, Let the Presbyterians give unto this Text whatever Sense they can, it will make nothing for 'em: but it highly favour our Episcopal Ordination in the most probable Interpretations that can be made of it; those Interpretations I mean wherein I have said either that *Paul* was one of the Prophets, or presided over the Presbyters, or ordain'd *Timothy* a second time. At least, I think it will follow from the whole that this is no wonderful Demonstration or

Proof of Ordination by ordinary Presbyters in a Parity.

I will only add, That I cannot yet find in Scripture any one Instance of an Assembly of ordinary Elders, that by themselves, without some Apostle or Apostles presiding over them, perform'd any one Act of Supreme Power or Jurisdiction ; particularly , it is not known to us, that they ever ordain'd alone by laying on hands. I will allow they did lay hands on with *Paul* : but this is perfectly our Episcopal Ordination, wherein the Bishop answering *Paul*, and the Presbyters present answering the Presbytery, do ordain such persons as are found fit in Ability, and are recommended by Testimonials from the people, among whom they have liv'd, for their Innocence and good Manners.

I will conclude this first Chapter with an Observation made against the Independents, which also will concern the Presbyterians who communicate with 'em, *viz.* That what inward Call soever any person pretends to, or whatever Gifts and Abilities he lays claim to, and though a people shall chuse him for their Pastor and Spiritual Guide, nevertheless he ought to be ordain'd. It is not improbable, that even *Matthias* himself was to ordain'd, after God by the Lots had fix'd the peoples Choice : It is certain that the seven Deacons were thus ordain'd after the Multitude had elected and presented them to the Apostles. *Paul*, called of God, was ordain'd
by

by Prophets; and *Timothy*, pointed out by Prophecy and Revelation, received the Gift by Imposition of hands. What Colour then have those Independent Pastors to minister in the Word and Sacraments, who have not been separated thereunto? Surely they will not equal their Call and Choice and their Abilities unto those persons just now mention'd. In a word, if I were a Presbyterian, yet I durst not communicate with them.

A P P E N D I X.

I Have not yet made any mention of that Passage in *St. Peter*, 1 *Epist.* ch. 5. because I know not in what Order of Time to place it; and therefore chuse to treat of it here by it self. If this Epistle was writ before it was decreed throughout the world that one *Presbyter* should be set over the rest, nothing can be deduc'd hence for Presbyterian or against Episcopal Government. Let it then be imagin'd (for it cannot be prov'd) to have been wrote after the foresaid Decree, and then let us try whether any solid Argument can be built upon this place in favour of the Presbyterians.

"The Elders here are exhorted to two things, *μαγειν* and *προσέχειν*, to feed the flock, and to take the oversight of it; that

“ is, these Elders are in effect call'd Shep-
 “ herds and Bishops, which are the Titles of
 “ Supreme Power. And because they are
 “ thus spoken of in general Terms, without
 “ any distinction among 'em, or mention
 “ made of any Shepherd or Bishop above
 “ the rest, 'tis reasonable hence to conclude
 “ that these Elders were in a Parity the su-
 “ preme Governours of those Churches, as
 “ our Adversaries plead.

Answer 1. Words have two Significations, a natural and an artificial. The former arises from the Signification of the Root or primitive Words whence they are derived, and of which they are compounded: Thus *ἐπίσκοπος* Bishop, signifies no more than one that has the Oversight or Care of any Business. The artificial Signification is arbitrarily impos'd upon the Word, and so signifies one that supervises some special matter or thing to which he is appointed. Thus Bishop signifies a certain Order or Rank of Church-Officers among us at this day. So the Twelve which Christ had chosen, he nam'd them *Apostles*, or *Sent.* (*Luke 6. 13.*) Let us then examine the Sense of *παιδραῖς* and *ἐπίσκοποι* in this place.

1. I am not satisfied that *παιδραῖς* feed the flock of God, implies the supreme Care and Charge of those Churches, or that these Elders must needs be the supreme Governours. When Jesus Christ admonish'd Peter (*Joh. 22. 16.*) *πῶς τὴν οὐρανίαν, feed my sheep*, I cannot

not allow that *Peter* was therefore declar'd Prince of the Apostles, and supreme Pastor of the Universal Church: For Jesus Christ, doubtless, was above him, and so were the College of Apostles. Nor do I find that Pastors or Shepherds do ever in Scripture signify artificially any one certain Rank and Degree of Church-Officers, except the lowest of all, *viz.* Teachers (*Eph.* 4. 11.) For they are the same sort there — *Some Pastors and Teachers*, the Apostle speaking in the Figure *is id est*, as appears from *1 Cor.* 12, 13. where in two Enumerations of 'em, *v.* 28, 29. he names Teachers only, and not Pastors. But however, let 'em be Shepherds, or Pastors, yet *Peter* was a Shepherd above 'em, and Christ was a Shepherd above 'em both: he was the *good Shepherd* (*Joh.* 10. 14.) the *great Shepherd* (*Heb.* 13. 20.) the *chief Shepherd* (*1 Pet.* 5. 4.) Briefly, among these Elders there might have been several degrees of Shepherds, unto all whom the Apostle might say — *Feed the flock of Christ*. And if at *Peter's* writing this Epistle *one Presbyter* was decreed to be set over the rest, then one Shepherd also over the other. In short, it might be one way or the other, for ought any thing can be drawn certainly from this Phrase.

Episcopus also, or Bishop, is a common word, and of Latitude, and naturally signifies nothing more than an Overseer, as I have already noted. If we would render our Over-

seers of the Poor into Greek, we must call 'em, *οἱ ἐν πτωχείᾳ ἐπισκοποι*; and thus the seven Deacons were Bishops, or Overseers of the Poor. The Apostleship is call'd *ἐπισκοπὴ*, or Bishoprick, and Jesus Christ *the Bishop of our Souls*: and Ignatius styles Jesus Christ the Bishop of † Syria, and God the Father Bishop of all. The Elders, it is true, are frequently call'd Bishops, and I will grant in an artificial Sense too; but at the same time it will not prove these in St. Peter were the supreme Bishops or Governours of those Churches: There might be others above them. Notwithstanding then *ποιμάνειν* and *ἐπισκοπεῖν*, those two Titles of Shepherd and Bishop, might at that very time of Peter's writing have been appropriated to one chief Ruler. For one Conjugate may have an artificial Signification fixt upon it, and not another; *ex. gr.* The seven Deacons are said (*εὐαγγελιστῶν*) to preach good Tidings, *Acts* 8. 4, 5, 12, 35, 40. and *Ch.* 11. 20. but they were not Evangelists in the Artificial Sense impos'd upon that Word. Again, it will not follow that the seventy Disciples were Apostles because Jesus Christ *ἀπέστειλεν* sent them on an Errand (*Luke* 10. 1.) For *Apostle* in its natural Signification is but a *Messenger* (*Philip.* 2. 25.) So though Elders were *ποιμάνειν* and *ἐπισκοπεῖν* to feed the flock and take the oversight of it, 'twill not follow they were Bishops in Title, or Supreme Rulers. Briefly, nothing of

of Certainty can be collected from Words. If I read any express Commission given to these Elders for exercising the several supreme Acts of Power and Authority, such as I have noted in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, Reason would that just Consideration should be had of it. But it will by no means follow, that because they are exhorted *ποιμαίνοντες καὶ ἐκτρέφοντες* to feed and to take the Oversight of the Flock, they were therefore Bishops or Shepherds in the artificial and limited Signification of those Words, or that they were Supreme Rulers. Lastly,

It may with good Reason be said, that *St. Peter* writing to the Churches of *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia*, and *Bithynia*, Ep. 1. Ch. 1. 1. might mean the chief or first Elder of every of these Churches, as, the Presbyter or Bishop of *Pontus*, the Presbyter or Bishop of *Galatia*, &c. For which Reason afterwards he admonishes that the younger submit themselves to the elder, that is, the Junior Presbyters to the Senior Presbyters. For I have heard of the Senior Alderman in a Corporation, and a Junior. It does in no wise diminish the Authority of the Governors of these Churches, that the Apostle calls them Presbyters by a Name common to an inferiour Rank. For the Apostle calls himself a Presbyter, and yet in the same breath puts 'em in Remembrance of his Apostolical Power, when he styles himself *ἀποστόλος ἡ τοῦ ἡγεῖντος ἐκκλησίας* (which is the characteristical Note of an

an Apostle, *Acts* 1. 22.) even as in the beginning he had prefac'd his Epistle, *Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ*. As therefore St. Peter by a *junior*, or Minoration of himself took but the common Name of Presbyter, and levell'd himself with the Elders; so might he do with the Senior Presbyters or Supreme Rulers of those Churches. In short, nothing can be concluded from Titles, since there is scarce one artificial Title belonging to Church-Officers, which is not attributed to Jesus Christ; as, Priest, Shepherd, Apostle, Deacon, Prophet, and Bishop, *1 Pet.* 2. 25. But I hope our Adversaries will not degrade Jesus Christ into the Order of Apostles, neither will they advance *Epaphroditus* to the degree of an Apostle, though he is so call'd (*2 Philip.* 25.) that is, *Messenger*.

CHAP.

C H A P. II.

*Of the Government of the Church of
Ephesus and Crete in particular.*

I Am now come to an end of my travels in the general History of the Government of the Church in the Apostles days; but how it was after the Apostles decease, and how it ought to be at this day remains the question; or what course they in their life-time took in settling Church Government for future Ages is worth the enquiry; and this is the next Task I have undertaken, and in pursuing it will keep my self within the compass of the Scriptures, and the time that one or more of the Apostles were living, or very near to it. It must be confess'd, that the New Testament does not furnish us with a body of Canon Laws establish'd by Christ or his Apostles, whereby the precise method of Government was determin'd; we shall therefore be oblig'd to pick what is to be had out of the familiar Epistles of the Apostles, wherein they, as all other Writers of that kind, frequently allude to the Rules and Customs of their own times; and what they thus allude to, must of necessity be taken for the practice and establish'd Law. Now we have taken it for granted before, that
every

every apostle govern'd the Churches, which himself planted, by a College or Body of Presbyters, subject or subordinate to that Apostle. But the Apostles were mortal like all other Men; and who did or were to succeed in the supreme Government after their death deserves to be examin'd. If they took no care, nor made any provision in this case, it may be thought that the Government fell of course, and must be thought as intended to fall into the Hands of the Presbyteries acting in a parity of power, and that as Jesus Christ refused to appoint any Head or Supreme among the Apostles, but left them in a parity, even so it must be presum'd that every Apostle left the Presbyters of every Church with joint power to order and govern the Affairs thereof. This inference, however plausible it looks, I cannot allow of. For there was a special reason of Jesus Christ's not appointing any one as the supreme Governour over the rest of the Apostles, viz. because, he intended they should separate and disperse themselves throughout the World for propagating the Gospel; and therefore it was needless to appoint one over the rest. But 'twas not so with the Apostles and their Presbyteries. The ordinary Elders were to be Ministers of Christ fixt in their places, and so it was necessary for the Apostles to prescribe (as doubtless they did) some sort of Government whatever it was, and not leave it at random, nor to the discretion of those that came after 'em, and this (as I aim to demonstrate) was what

at

at this day we call Episcopal Government.

In order to make out this, I undertake to shew particularly, that *St. Paul* toward the declining part of his life, and in his absence from Churches did not commit the Government to the Presbyteries in a parity, but appointed one as supreme to preside over 'em in his absence, and so by consequence to succeed him, when he departed the World. This I shall demonstrate he did in the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, and by a reasonable consequence in all his other Churches, and so by the same reasonable consequence the rest of the Apostles must be understood to have done the same. And first then let us see as to the Church of *Ephesus*. Hereof I will treat, 1. Of its Plantation and Government by *St. Paul* so long as he was in a condition to manage the affairs of the Church. 2. I will shew the last orders he took about the Government of this Church of *Ephesus* in his absence. 3. I will pursue the rest of the story of the *Ephesian* Church unto the writing of *St. Ignatius* his Epistles, &c.

As to the first. *St. Paul* laid the foundation of a Christian Church at *Ephesus*, tarrying among 'em three years, as he tells 'em (*Act. 20. 31.*) For (*ch. 18. v. 19.*) *He came to Ephesus and entered into the Jewish Synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews* doubtless concerning the Gospel of Christ. We need not fear to affirm he then converted many of 'em, because (*v. 20.*) *They desired him to tarry longer time with them,*

them, which is a sign they entertain'd, or at least were disposed to entertain his Doctrine. But his design'd journey to Jerusalem hinder'd him. Afterwards Paul return'd again to Ephesus, when he ordain'd, as 'tis believ'd, twelve Persons (v. 6.) He laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophes'd. Three months at the second visit he disputed and perswaded the things concerning the Kingdom of God in the Jewish Synagogue, and then was forc'd to retire thence with his new Converts unto the School of one Tyrannus; where he disputed daily about the same matters, and this for the space of two years more; and the effect was (v. 10.) that from all quarters of Asia men repaired thither, and great conversions were made. From hence Paul pass'd into Macedonia (ch. 20. 1.) From whence after some while bending his course towards Jerusalem, he returned back through Asia, and making an halt at Miletus, he order'd the Ephesian Elders to meet him there (ch. 20. 17.) Who, and how many these Elders were is not said; but it seems reasonable to believe they were the Twelve spoken of before, and the other Elders ordained in that Church at the Apostles first being there, if happily any were then ordain'd. To these Twelve Paul made an Harangue, wherein among other things he forewarns em thus (v. 29.) For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous Wolves enter in among you not sparing the Flock. Also of your own selves shall

shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away Disciples after them. And he exhorts 'em to feed the Flock of Christ over which the Holy Ghost had made 'em Overseers (v. 28.) Some things are here to be remark'd. 1. That the Apostle committed the Government of this Church in his absence unto these Presbyters (or Bishops.) For I'll suppose at present that the Title Bishop belong'd to 'em and signifies the same Persons as Presbyters, yea and the same power too: 2. That *Paul* certainly fore-saw that Schisms would arise among 'em, and that not only from Foreign Wolves that wou'd intrude; but that some of these Elders themselves would rend that Church into Pieces and Factions, each one drawing away Disciples after him. The Apostles some time after being held Prisoner at Rome, thence wrote a Letter to the *Ephesians*, (as well as to several other Churches in the East) some part whereof is design'd against Schism and for uniting them. For it seems what he had foretold at *Miletus* was in some degree already come to pass. Wherefore (ch. 4. of that Epistle to the *Ephesians*) he entertains them with a warm and effectual discourse about Unity and against separation, the like whereof we meet not any where, but in her Sister Church of *Corinth*, which also was pester'd with Schisms, 1 *Cor.* 12.

2. The second thing to be spoken of is the Order he took afterwards about the Government of the Church of *Ephesus*. The Apostle being set at liberty, and returning back from
Italy

Italy to the East, and being now old (*Phil. v. 9.*) as also finding that Factions and Divisions began everywhere to increase and prevail, constituted *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus* (as doubtless he did the same in all other places) or the sole and supreme Governor of that Church, as appears from the 3 v. of the 1. ch. of the 1. Epistle to *Timothy*, *I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other Doctrine.* Here is a Commission offer'd unto *Timothy* to be a Judge of the Doctrine which the Elders of that Church should Preach, and to admonish 'em if it were false, and not according to Faith and Godliness; or if we may, as I think we ought to fill up this passage with that other parallel to it, (*Tit. 1. 11.*) *To stop their mouths and silence them.* *Timothy* we may imagine was not very forward to undertake that great Charge, being both young and modest and unhealthful; nor did *St. Paul* command him, perhaps for the same reasons, but only intreated him to accept it. Nor indeed was it fit he should be forc'd to it, it being improper to compel any Man to accept of a Charge against his inclinations. Therefore *St. Paul* only intreated him, but so earnestly and effectually that *Timothy* at length was perswaded to undertake it, as appears from what follows.

For the Apostle shortly after, having not perhaps as yet given him full and sufficient instructions for that weighty Office, sent him
this

this first Epistle, wherein after he had put *Timothy* in remembrance, how he had already constituted him Bishop of *Ephesus*, he then changes his stile from the Preter to the Present Tense, from intreaties to commands: (For tho' the Apostle only besought him to accept the Office, yet after his acceptance he did and might justly admonish him of his Duty, yea and command him.) In the first place then he thus writes unto him--- *This charge I commit unto thee Son Timothy, according to the Prophecies which went before of thee* (Eph. i. 18.) But because, as I said before, St. Paul had not perhaps furnish'd *Timothy* with sufficient instructions for the discharging that weighty calling, the Apostle up and down in this Epistle has given him many Rules to observe: And as I take it 'twas his chief design so to do, tho', after his own way of writing, he makes frequent sallies and excursions unto other matters. For so he did in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, the principal design whereof was to chide 'em for their Schisms, to assert his Apostolical Authority over 'em, and to exhort 'em unto Unity; yet he very often falls into digressions about other matters, both of Faith, Godliness, and Morality. We are therefore now to pick out of this Epistle the particular Rules and Orders, which St. Paul prescrib'd unto his Son *Timothy*, for the better discharging of his Episcopal Office at *Ephesus*. As,

E

I. The

1. The Apostle acquaints him with the necessary qualifications that were to be requir'd in all Persons, that should be ordain'd Bishops (or Elders) and Deacons, ch. 3. from the 2. to the 15. verse, where he concludes that Argument thus.

These things write I unto thee, that thou mayest know how thou ought est to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church of the living God (at Ephesus); that thou (not the Elders) mayest know, how thou oughtest to behave thy self (not how the Elders ought to behave themselves.) For Timothy was to take due care, that all who were to be made Presbyters and Deacons were qualify'd as was before directed. It was then to be Timothy's part and care alone, or chiefly to see to the qualifications of those, who were to be ordain'd at Ephesus unto the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

2. The Apostle exhorts Timothy, that the Elders which rule well, be accounted worthy of double honour, especially they, who labour in the Word and Doctrine (ch. 5. v. 17.) Twas Timothy's business it seems to see to this also, not the ordinary Elders.

By being counted worthy of double honour is meant (as the Apostle explains himself in the Reason wherewith he confirms his Order) double Maintenance out of the publick Treasure of the Church——. For it is written (says he) *Thou shalt not muzzle the Ox that treadeth out the Corn; and the Labourer is worthy*

thy of his reward: of which passage in the Law the Apostle makes use once more to the same purpose, 1 Cor. 9. 9.

3. St. Paul further prescribes—*Against an Elder, receive not an accusation under two or three witnesses* (ch. 5. 19.) The full meaning whereof must be, that *Timothy* should not proceed unto sentence against the Elder, except the accusation was prov'd by at least two good Witnesses. So *receive* must signifie. For otherwise a Judge may receive and hear an accusation of High Treason, though supported but by one Witness alone, or upon suspicion only: But he may not proceed to judgment against the Party accus'd, except the crime laid to his charge be attested by at least two Witnesses. *Timothy* then had the power of hearing, trying, and giving judgment upon Elders, if they were found to have offended; if otherwise, to acquit 'em.

4. Upon supposition that the Elders were prov'd guilty by two sufficient Witnesses, then (says St. Paul) *them that sin, rebuke before all* (v. 20.) That is, rebuke them publickly, yea and (as 'tis said in *Titus*) *sharply* (ch. 1. 13.) And *with all authority too* (ch. 2. 15.) This trust likewise was committed unto *Timothy*, viz. To chide offending Elders severely before all the Presbytery; yea, and it must be added, that, if the offenders did not reform, after a second admonition to *reject them* (*Tit.* 3. v. 10.)

5. Whereas the Apostle had laid down (ch. 3.) sundry very necessary qualifications requisite in them, that were to be made Presbyters or Deacons; yet had not so clearly determin'd (as some will be ready to say) who were to ordain them, he gives *Timothy* this precaution — *Lay hands suddenly on no man*, which words necessarily imply that *Timothy* was to ordain the Elders and Deacons by laying on of Hands, *St. Paul* not so much as joining the Presbyters with him. And that *Timothy* was now invested by *St. Paul*, but with the ordinary power of Ordaining (not as a Prophet commanded by Revelation, whom he was to ordain) appears, not only that there is no mention of any such thing, but also because the Apostle (as has been noted) prescribed *Timothy* to see to the necessary Qualifications of those that were Candidates for the Ministerial Function, (ch. 3.) And here again, (ch. 5. 22.) warns him not to be partaker of other Mens Sins, which he must needs be, if he ordain'd 'em suddenly without enquiring into their Qualifications and Fitness. And again he saith *Keep thy self pure from other Men's Sins*, which thou canst never do, if thou rashly layest hands on them and neglectest to examine, whether they are duly qualified unto so great a Work. All which had been impertinent, if *Timothy* had acted as a Prophet. Finally in the midst of these four last Rules in this 5th. Chap. *Paul* presses upon *Timothy* the exact observance of

of his Duty so solemnly and so magisterially, that one may justly wonder any men should question, whether *Paul* intended *Timothy* for the Bishop of *Ephesus*, or should dream that the Prescriptions here given were not design'd for *Timothy*, but as a Rule for all Elders in their ordaining others. Thus *St. Paul* writes (v. 21.) *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the Elect Angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by Partiality;* which agrees with what was noted before (from ch. 3. v. 15.) *That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the house of God which is the Church.*

6. *St. Paul* thus writes unto *Timothy*, *The things, which thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also,* (2. Ep. 2. 2.) These Words are capable of two Senses: either, 1. That *Timothy* should commit or transmit all the Apostles Instructions and the Power receiv'd from him to faithful Men his Successors, who might also be able to teach and convey the same Power to others (their Successors) But I'll not insist upon so uncertain a Gloss.

But then, *Secondly*, It must be meant, that *Timothy* was to commit, what he had heard of *Paul*, unto able and faithful Men, such as he judg'd fit to teach others, or in the language of the Church at this day, to *Institute* *em*. This agrees with that in *Titus*, (ch. 1. 5.) *And ordain Elders in every City:* 'Tis in

the Greek *Katations*, appoint, establish and fix 'em in their Cures. So then here is another part of Episcopal Jurisdiction committed unto *Timothy*, viz. Instituting or Constituting Elders *oppidatim*, in every Town where there was occasion for 'em.

Lastly, *St. Paul* in the fourth and last Chapter of the second Epistle, puts *Timothy* in remembrance of his whole Duty, of preaching the Word diligently, reproving, rebuking, exhorting (vers. 2.) As a Motive hereunto, he warns him of Hereticks, that would arise even out of the *Ephesian* Elders themselves, and perhaps were already risen (See Chap. 3.) Reminding him farther, that every Sect and parcel of humourfom Men *having itching ears*, would chuse and heap to themselves their own Teachers, who preach'd not according to Truth, but after the Lusts and Inclinations of their Audience (vers. 3. 4.) Therefore (says the Apostle) *watch thou in all things, indure Afflictions, do the work of an Evangelist, make full proof of thy Ministry* (vers. 5.) Or discharge all those trusts that I have at any time committed unto thee, whether in this or in the former Epistle. And why does the Apostle lie so close upon him at this time? He gives the Reason himself. *For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.* A most powerful and perswasive Reason. "I *Paul* the Apostle, "who have hitherto my self had a watchful "eye upon the Church of *Ephesus*, and can
" no

"no longer do it, being shortly to leave the
 "World, do therefore now exhort thee unto
 "double diligence, the Burden being like
 "henceforth to lie upon thee alone: *do there-
 "fore the work of an Evangelist, and fulfil thy
 "Ministry* every way; and this I the rather
 "press now upon thee, because of those Er-
 "rors and Heresies, and Schisms, which are
 "creeping in among you, and which you
 "must contend against with all Vigor and
 "Application, especially seeing I shall not be
 "able to assist you any longer my self." In
 short, the dying Apostle seems now to be mak-
 ing his last Will, leaving *Timothy* in the sole
 and full Possession of the *Ephesian Church*.

And with these Powers was *Timothy* in-
 trusted by *St. Paul* at *Ephesus*. Not but
 that *Timothy* as long as *Paul* lived, may be
 granted to have been subordinate; that is,
 answerable to the Apostle in the Ministration
 of these Acts of Jurisdiction, if happily any
 occasion should be given, and the Apostle
 should be able to interpose.

How long *Timothy* liv'd after *Paul* in the
 exercise of his Episcopal Office at *Ephesus*, we
 know not from Scripture: but that at his
 Death he left a Successor, with the same
 Powers, may be made very probable, yea
 unquestionable, from three Observations.

1. It's no ways likely, but that *Timothy* was
 expressly empower'd by *St. Paul* to provide for
 the future Government of the Church; and
 perhaps his Commission is in that (2 *Tim* 2. 2.)

E 4

Or

Or if not, yet he would of his own accord settle it upon the same bottom that himself had receiv'd it from the Apostle, and think himself oblig'd so to settle it.

2. And that *Timothy* did so, is manifest from the History of the Church of *Ephesus* even in the Life-time of *John* (the last Apostle) and immediately after his Death, as we are now in order to set forth.

For the next News we hear of the Church of *Ephesus* is in the second Chapter of the *Revelations*. The Message which Jesus Christ sent by St. *John* unto the Church of *Ephesus*, was directed to the Angel of that Church, in the Singular Number. If that Church of *Ephesus* had then been govern'd by a Presbytery, the Message must have been express either in the Plural, or at least by some Noun of Multitude: but being 'tis said Angel, in the Singular Number, and because there was

† Deuterion. ch.
32. v. 2. *apud*
70 Interpre. Van.
12. 1. Ch. 19.
12. 13.

an Opinion current in those days, † that every Province had its peculiar Guardian Angel, it is probable that this is an Allusion thereto, and that the Bishop is here call'd the Angel, that is, the President and Ruler of the Church of *Ephesus*. 'Tis indeed objected, that in the Message unto *Thyatira*, vers. 18. the Number is Plural (vers. 24.) *ὑμῖν ὁ ἀγγελος λέγει καὶ τοῖς ἐν θυατείρῃ*, But unto you (plural) I say, and unto the rest in *Thyatira*; as if the former part of the Message had not been brought

brought to a single Person, or to the Angel, but to many; and the latter part of it to the rest of them. Not here to insist on the various Lesson which in the King's M. runs thus, *ὁ μὲν ἔλεγε τοῖς λοιποῖς*, but to you, the rest in *Thyatira*, I say; and so the People are distinguish'd from (their Bishop) the Angel, unto whom the Spirit is believ'd to have spoken before.

I say, not to insist on this, that which I offer against this small critical Objection is, that these Messages or Letters were directed unto the Angel (or Bishop) of every Church, to be communicated to the People or Church: that therefore the matter of these Messages or Letters is not intended as spoken of, or unto the Bishops, but to the Body of the Christian People, of whom the Churches consisted *; *ex. gr.* Rev. 1, 4, 11. vers. 18. *Unto the Angel of the Church of Thyatira write: this* 2. 7, 11, 17, 29. 3. 6, 13, 22. is to the Bishop; then vers. 19.

I knew thy works, &c. This and what follows belongs not to the Bishop, but to the Church of *Thyatira*, that is, the Christian Congregation; not thy, the Bishop's Works, but thy, the Church's or Christian People's Works. Now when Jesus Christ had reprov'd many of this Church that had suffer'd and conniv'd at such as were guilty of spiritual Fornication, although themselves were not guilty thereof, he adds, vers. 24. — *but unto you and to the rest*, that is, to you who yourselves

selves are not guilty of spiritual Fornication, but only have conniv'd at others; unto you, I say, and to the rest in *Thyatira*, as many as have not this Doctrine of *Jezebel* (or Idolatry) and who have not so much as suffer'd it, I will put upon you none other burthen, &c. I say then, the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* ought in all Reason to be understood of the Bishop thereof, to whom the Message was writ or directed, that he might communicate it to his Church, as being chief Pastor thereof.

If it had been sent unto the Presbytery, it ought not to have been call'd Angel; or if to one Presbyter more eminent than the rest though not of more Power and Authority, he ought not to have been call'd Angel, which imports Superiority and Authority over the Church. And this is another Argument that confirms *Timothy* to have transmitted Episcopal Government unto the Church of *Ephesus*.

In short, St. *Paul's* Epistles to *Timothy*, and the Spirit's Message to the Church of *Ephesus*, and its Angel mutually give and receive Light to and from one another.

But 3. The Apostle St. *John* dying shortly after, the next News we hear of *Ephesus* is in the Epistle of the Holy Bishop of *Antioch Ignatius*, to that Church, as he was going to *Rome* to suffer Martyrdom. I will here transcribe thence what is pertinent to our present Argument.

Therein

Therein *Ignatius* makes honourable mention
 of their Bishop *Onesimus*, of their Presbyters
Croesus, *Euplius*, and *Fronto*, and one *Barrhus*
 a Deacon. He exhorts 'em to love *Onesimus*
 their Bishop. " 'Tis therefore (*says he*) fit
 " that ye every way glorifie Jesus Christ,
 " that being subject unto the Bishop, and to
 " the Presbytery, ye may be holy. Follow
 " the Institution of God. For Je-
 " sus Christ our Life, is the || De- || *Psalm* 2. 7.
 " cree and Institution of the Fa-
 " ther, even as they the Bishops appoint-
 " ed throughout the World are the Institu-
 " tion of Jesus Christ. Wherefore 'tis fit
 " that ye follow and obey the Will or the
 " Sentence of your Bishop. For if I had for
 " a while such spiritual Fellowship with your
 " Bishop, how much more do I think you
 " happy, being thus join'd unto him as the
 " Church is to Jesus Christ, and as Jesus
 " Christ is unto God, to the end all things
 " may agree in Unity. Let no man err. If
 " any one is not within the Altar (*in Unity*
 " *with the Bishop*) he is depriv'd of the Bread
 " of God : For if the Prayer of one or two
 " is so prevalent, how much more the Pray-
 " er of the Bishop and of the whole Church.
 " Whosoever therefore comes not to the As-
 " sembly with the Bishop, he is proud and
 " self-condemn'd. Let us therefore study not
 " to resist the Bishop, that we may be the
 " obedient Subjects of God. By how much
 " the more silent any one observes the Bishop
 " is

“ is (that is, if the Bishop is not violent in as-
 “ serting his own Power) let such an one re-
 “ verence and fear that Bishop so much the
 “ more: For whom the Master sends unto
 “ the Administration of his own Household, we
 “ ought so to receive him as the Master him-
 “ self who sent him. 'Tis then manifest that
 “ we ought to look upon the Bishop as upon
 “ the Lord himself. Indeed *Onesimus* your
 “ Bishop does exceedingly commend your
 “ good Order in God, because ye live accor-
 “ ding to the Truth, and because no Heresie
 “ remains among you — to the end ye
 “ may obey the Bishop and the Presbytery
 “ with an undivided mind, breaking one
 “ Bread, the Medicine of Immortality.

The like hereunto the said holy Martyr
 wrote to several other Churches, to the *Mag-
 nesians*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Philadelphians*,
 to the *Smyrneans*, and to their Bishop *Polycarp*
 in particular, and something he has added
 in that to the *Romans* concerning himself. Of
 all which I shall say nothing at present, see-
 ing I shall have a more convenient place for
 these noble Passages of Antiquity. Only let
 it be noted, that *Ignatius* Bishop of *Syria*, or
 of *Antioch* the Metropolis of *Syria*, wrote the
 aforesaid Epistles about nine or ten years af-
 ter the Death of *St. John* the Apostle. It
 cannot with Reason be thought that so holy
 a Christian Bishop and Martyr should him-
 self dare so much as attempt an Alteration
 of Government in the Church, which was
 con-

contrary to the Mind of Christ, or of his Apostles; or that it could be effected so suddenly after *John's* Death, especially in so many of the *Asiatick* Churches, among whom *John* had for the most part his Residence: But why do I say in those few Churches of *Asia*? being, as he tells us, Bishops were *throughout the World*.

I will here take my Leave of *Ephesus* after I have summ'd up the whole Evidence.

St. Paul the Apostle, and Founder of the Church of *Ephesus*, having himself a good while govern'd it by a Presbytery subordinate to him, and finding that Schisms were increased among 'em, and that through the Ambition and Emulation of the Elders, did toward the latter end of his Life, suspecting he was not to see 'em any more, nor have Opportunity to rule and govern them any longer as he was wont, being about to depart again toward *Italy* and the utmost parts of the West, desire *Timothy* to take upon him the Government of that Church (1 *Epist.* 1.3.) and shortly after wrote him a Letter (1 *Epist.*) ordering him how he was to behave himself in this Office. He puts him in mind that he had been designed thereunto by special Revelation, and that this was the Reason of *Paul's* committing the Charge to him (chap. 1. 18.) And having done so, *St. Paul* farther advises and charges him to take care of the Qualifications required in every one admitted to the Office of Elder or Deacon (chap. 3.) To see that

that such Elders that rul'd well and labour'd in the Word and Doctrine, should be encourag'd and recompenc'd with more honourable Maintenance: How to receive Accusation against Elders, and upon what Testimony to proceed unto Sentence against 'em: To rebuke such Elders as were found to have offended: To ordain Elders, but not suddenly: And in a word, to do all things without Partiality (chap. 5. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.) To commit the Charge of preaching and ministring in the Word and Sacraments unto able and faithful men (2 *Epist.* 2. 2.) And finally, he delivers up the whole Power of that Church unto *Timothy* just before his Death (chap. 4. 5, 6.) After all this, we read of the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* (*Rev.* 2. 1.) about thirty years after *Paul's* Death, and in the Lifetime of *John* the Apostle. About ten years after *John's* Death we read of *Onesimus* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and the *Ephesians* in many and very pressing words, exhorted to be subject and united with him in all things. In short, nothing can be more manifest, than that this Church was governed by one single Person over the rest, from its first Conversion to the days of the Death of *Ignatius*, though perhaps not all this while by one Title or Name; first by an Apostle, then by an Evangelist, then by an Angel, lastly by a Bishop. And what *St. Paul* did in settling this Church, he must in reason be thought to have done in all others. And what *St. Paul* did in all his Church-

Churches, it is no question with me, but the other Apostles did in the Churches founded by them *throughout the world*, as *Ignatius* testifies.

As for *Paul* himself, he appointed the same Government in the Isle of *Crete* also, as I now proceed to shew out of his Epistle to *Titus*. Here indeed it must be confest, that the Testimonies are fewer in number than those in the Epistles to *Timothy*, but more strong and pregnant in themselves.

Note then, that *Paul* puts *Titus* in remembrance for what Cause he had left him in *Crete*, that is, what *Titus* was to do there (chap. 1. 5.) Let us see what it was.

1. It was to set in order the things which were wanting. For because the Service of the Gospel required *Paul's* Presence in other Places, and he had not leisure to tarry here in *Crete* long enough thoroughly to establish and settle all necessary or very convenient things, He therefore committed his Trust and Power unto *Titus*.

2. It was to ordain Elders in every City, which was the thing *Paul* had before appointed him. I do not think this place rightly render'd into *English*. By ordaining we understand the giving a general and solemn Power or Commission of ministering in the Word and Sacraments by the laying on of Hands, which goes before the assigning Presbyters their Power and special Places, wherein they are to Minister. Thus the Apostle says of the Seven
Men

Men presented to them for that purpose
 — Whom we will appoint (*ut agimus*) over
 this business, viz. The publick Alms; but they
 first ordain'd 'em Deacons, and then it must
 be understood that they afterwards appointed
 them over that business. So here—*ita
 etiam* should strictly be render'd, that thou
 mightest appoint and settle Elders in every
 City, as thou shalt find necessary and most
 useful for the Church. Not but that it must
 be presupposed that *Titus* had the power of
 ordaining, even as *Timothy* had. For the Epi-
 stles to *Timothy* and *Titus* must illustrate one
 another, and whatever Trust or Power was
 given to the one, must be understood to have
 been given unto the other also, as I do and
 shall all along take for a granted. The
 Words then ought more fully to run thus,

*That thou mightest ordain and
 appoint Elders in every City.* For
 'tis not at all likely, that *Titus*
 should have Authority to institute and appoint
 Elders in the Cities, and yet not to ordain
 'em by laying on of hands. 'Tis
 true it must not be meant precisely of all the
 Cities in *Crete*, as if there were already parti-

So the learned
 Bp. P. I since find
 seems to under-
 stand the place
 which he thus
 renders—*Ordina-
 verat constitue-
 retq. Annual Pauli-
 lina*.

cular Churches establish'd, or Christians enough
 to be form'd into Churches in the hundred
 Cities of *Crete*, but in every City where
 it was then fit and necessary, and in all other
 Cities where conversions should be made; In
 every

every such City *Titus* was charg'd to ordain and appoint Elders.

3. *Paul* intrusts him with the care and charge of seeing unto the Merits and due Qualifications of the Elders to be ordained and constituted in the Cities of *Crete* (v. 6, 7, 8, 9.) The same, though more compendious than those in the 1. Ep. *Tim.* 3. ch. And this shews us that the Qualifications of a Bishop or Elder, mention'd in that 1. *Tim.* 3. ch. were intended by *Paul* as Instructions to *Timothy* not to lay hands suddenly on them; but first examine whether they were duly qualify'd. For though *Paul* in his familiar Epistle to *Timothy*, did not observe an exact Method and Connexion of the Matters contain'd in that Letter, yet this passage in *Titus* tells us, that *Timothy* as well as *Titus*, were to require these Qualifications in those, whom they ordain'd and constituted Elders in their Churches. They are immediately subjoin'd in the Epistle to *Titus*, and therefore must be meant so in that to *Timothy*.

In a word then, 'twas *Titus's* business carefully to look that fit Persons were employ'd in the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of *Crete*. And he must be suppos'd to be made hereby a Judge of their fitness and due Qualifications; as also it must be understood of *Timothy*.

4. The Apostle impowers him ch. 1. 11. To stop the Mouths or silence false Teachers, to rebuke 'em sharply *ἀποκρίσεις* (v. 13.) that is ^{1 Tim.}

F

(v. 10.) 1. 9.

(v. 10.) the *ἀσυντάκτοι* the unruly or Nonconformists &c. And ch. 2. 15. *With all Authority ἐπιταγῇ* commanding them, and not suffering thy self or thy Authority to be despis'd.

§. St. Paul thus instructs him (ch. 3. 10) *A Man that is an Heretick, after the first or second Admonition reject.* Such as thou hast openly before all, and sharply and with all Authority rebuk'd once and again, if they remain obstinate suspend them from the exercise of their Ministry, deprive 'em of that Congregation or Parish over which they have been set, or Excommunicate 'em. In short then, and to conclude this, here we have *Titus* intrusted with all the principal and material parts of Episcopal Jurisdiction, as 'tis exercis'd among us at this day. It must be confess'd that we have no further account of the Government of this Church of *Crete* within the time of the Apostles or of any of 'em living. In room therefore of that, and because *Ignatius* was Familiar and Contemporary with St. *John* and wrote his Epistles but about nine Years after that Apostles Death, I will here add what Evidences are to be found in his Epistles to several *Asiatick* Churches. I have already collected sufficient out of that to the Church of *Ephesus*. The next in order according to the *English* Edition is to be that to the *Magnesians*, but is the third in *Vossius's* Greek Edition.

“Herein the Holy Martyr commends their
“worthy Bp. *Demas*, and two excellent Pres-
byters

byters *Bassus* and *Apollonius*, and *Sotio* the
 Deacon, which last he praises for his being
 subject to the Bishop as to the Grace of
 God, and to the Presbytery as to the Law
 of Jesus Christ. He then admonishing 'em,
 that it became them the *Magnesian* belie-
 vers, not to abuse or despise the Youth of
 their Bishop; but according to the power of
 God the Father, to pay him all reverence
 even as he knew the holy Presbyters did: Not
 taking any advantage against him for his
 Youth, but wisely yielding unto him obe-
 dience in God; but not so much unto him
 as unto the Father of Jesus Christ the Bishop
 of all. In honour therefore of him, whose
 will it is, 'tis fit you obey the Bishop with-
 out Hypocrisie. For as much as a Man does
 not deceive the Bishop whom he sees, but im-
 poses upon him, who is invisible. For what-
 ever of this kind is done, the Hypocrisie is
 not against Man who is Flesh, but against
 God, who knows the Secrets of the Heart.

'Tis therefore fit, not only that you be
 call'd Christians, but be such indeed, as
 there are some who call him Bishop, but do
 all things without him, without his Consent,
 and out of Communion with him. These
 Men seem not to be conscientious, because
 they do not assemble together intirely ac-
 cording to the Commandment of God.

Forasmuch therefore as I have as it were
 in the foresaid Persons, *Demas* Bishop, *Bas-*
sus and *Apollonius* Presbyters, and *Sotio* Dea-
 con,

"con, seen the whole Multitude of the be-
 "lieving *Magnesians* in Faith and Love, I ex-
 "hort that you study to do all things in di-
 "vine Concord, your Bishop presiding in the
 "place of God, and the Presbyters in the
 "place of the Council of the Apostles, and
 "your Deacons most dear to me and concre-
 "dited with the Ministry of Jesus Christ —
 "Be ye united to the Bishop, and to those
 "who preside over you, for a Pattern and
 "Document of Incorruption.

"As therefore the Lord did nothing with-
 "out the Father being united to him, neither
 "by himself, nor by his Apostles, so neither
 "do ye any thing without the Bishop and the
 "Presbyters, neither endeavour that any
 "thing should appear reasonable privately to
 "your selves. But when you come together
 "into one place, let there be one (common)
 "Prayer, one Supplication, one Mind, one
 "Hope, in Love, in Joy, undefiled, even as
 "there is one Jesus Christ, than whom no-
 "thing is better. Wherefore go ye altoge-
 "ther as it were unto the Temple of God,
 "as unto one Altar, as unto one Jesus Christ,
 "who proceeded from one Father, and who
 "is and is gone unto that one Father.

"Be ye subject unto the Bishop and unto
 "one another, as Jesus Christ according to the
 "Flesh to the Father, and as the Apostles to
 "Christ and to the Father, and to the Spirit,
 "that there may be both a carnal and a spi-
 "ritual Union, that is, that ye may be uni-
 "ted in Body and Spirit.

He

“ He makes mention of *Polycarp* Bishop of
 “ *Smyrna*, whence he wrote this Epistle.

“ In his Epistle to the *Trallians*, he speaks
 “ of their Bishop *Polybius*, and mightily com-
 “ mends him, and praises them in that they
 “ were subject to their Bishop, as unto Jesus
 “ Christ; and that for this Reason they
 “ seemed to him not to live according to
 “ Men, but according to Jesus Christ — It
 “ is necessary (as you do) to do nothing
 “ without the Bishop, and also to be subject
 “ to the Presbytery as unto the Apostles of
 “ Jesus Christ our Hope.

“ Let all of you reverence the Deacons
 “ as Jesus Christ (*Cotelarius*
 “ — as the Command of Je- This place is
 “ sus Christ) and the Bishop doubtless some-
 “ as the Son of the Father what corrupt and
 “ (*Coteler*. — as the Image very perplex'd.
 “ of the Father;) but the Presbyters as the
 “ Council of God, and College of the Apo-
 “ stles: Without these, *viz.* Bishops, Priests,
 “ and Deacons, there is no Church.

“ Be ye inseparable from God, from Jesus
 “ Christ, and from the Bishop, and from the
 “ Ordinances of the Apostles. He that is
 “ within the Altar is pure; that is, he who
 “ does any thing without the Bishop, and
 “ the Presbytery, and the Deacons, he is
 “ not pure in his own Conscience.

“ Be subject to your Bishop, as to the
 “ Commandment of God; as also to the Pres-
 “ bytery.

“ In the Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, the
 “ Preamble of it, he thus begins, — Who
 “ is their eternal Joy (*speaking of Jesus Christ*)
 “ especially if they (*the Philadelphians*) be at
 “ one with the Bishop, and the Presbyters
 “ with him and the Deacons. Which *Bishop*,
 “ *he goes on*, took his Ministry not of himself,
 “ neither by Men, nor through Vainglory,
 “ but through the Love of God the Father,
 “ and the Lord Jesus Christ. Here he ex-
 “ ceedingly praises their Bishop.

“ As many as are of God and of Jesus
 “ Christ, these are with the Bishop; and as
 “ many as repenting come unto the Unity of
 “ the Church (*he intimates that there were*
 “ *Schismatics that departed from the Bishop*)
 “ these shall be of God. Do not err, my
 “ Brethren: If any one follows him that
 “ makes a Schism, he inherits not the King-
 “ dom of God. Study therefore to partake
 “ of our Eucharist: For there is but one Flesh
 “ of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup un-
 “ to the Union of his Blood, one Altar, as
 “ also one Bishop, with the Presbytery and
 “ Deacons.

“ I cry'd whilst I was among you, I spake
 “ with a loud Voice (*thus*) — Attend un-
 “ to the Bishop, and to the Presbytery,
 “ and to the Deacons. But some suspected
 “ that I, knowing before the Division of
 “ some of you, spake these words; whereas
 “ God is my Witness, for whom I am in
 “ Bonds, that I knew it not from Men, but
 “ the

" the Spirit told me, saying these words——
 " Do nothing without the Bishop—— Love
 " Unity—— Flee Divisions—— Be Follow-
 " ers of Jesus Christ as he was of the Father.
 " I therefore did my own business, as a man
 " entirely compos'd unto Unity. But where
 " there is Division and Wrath God dwells
 " not. The Lord therefore forgives all that
 " repent, if they repent and return unto the
 " Unity of God, and to the Counsel of the
 " Bishop. *Note here, that in the following words
 of this Paragraph the Schismaticks pretended that
 Bishops were not to be found among the Ancients
 nor in the Gospel.*

" In his Epistle to the Believers at Smyrna
 " he says—— All of you follow your Bishop
 " as Jesus Christ the Father, and the Pres-
 " bytery as the Apostles; but reverence the
 " Deacons as the Command of God. Let
 " no man do any thing that belongs to the
 " Church, without the Bishop. Let the Ce-
 " lebration of the Lord's Supper be esteem'd
 " good, which is under the Authority of the
 " Bishop, or of him to whom the Bishop shall
 " grant it. Where-ever the Bishop is, there
 " also let the People be; as where Jesus
 " Christ is, there is the Catholick Church.
 " It is not lawful to Baptize, nor to Commu-
 " nicate, without the Bishop. But what he
 " shall approve of the same, is well-pleasing
 " unto God, to the end that whatever is
 " done, may be secure and firm.

“ It is very reasonable that we should,
 “ whilst we have time, repent. 'Tis good to
 “ know God and the Bishop. He that ho-
 “ noureth the Bishop shall be honour'd of
 “ God. He that does any thing privately,
that is, without the Bishop's Knowledge and Con-
 “ sent, serves the Devil.

“ I salute your worthy Bishop, and your
 “ venerable Presbytery, and my Fellow-
 “ Servants the Deacons.

“ In his Epistle to *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyr-*
 “ *na*, in the Preamble — To *Polycarp* Bi-
 “ shop or Overseer of the Church of *Smyrna*,
 “ rather look'd upon or overseen by God
 “ the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

“ Let nothing be done without thy Know-
 “ ledge and Consent, nor do thou any thing
 “ without the Command of God.

“ If any Man thinks he knows more than
 “ the Bishop, he is ruin'd. 'Tis fit that both
 “ Husbands and Wives be joyn'd together
 “ with the Consent of the Bishop, that the
 “ Marriage be according to God, and not
 “ for Lust. — Take heed unto the Bishop,
 “ that God may be with you. My Soul be
 “ for them that are subject to the Bishop,
 “ Presbyters, and Deacons, and let my Por-
 “ tion be with them.

“ In his Epistle to the *Romans* thus —
 “ Because God has vouchsaf'd to grant that
 “ I should be the Bishop of *Syria*, having sent
 “ for me from the East to the West, and
 “ calling me to be a Witness of his Sufferings
 “ and

" and of his going from the World unto God
 " (*that is, of his Ascension:*) And again, Re-
 " member in your Prayer the Church which
 " is in *Syria*, which in my stead now has
 " the Lord only for its Shepherd, saying, I
 " am the good Shepherd, and he alone, as
 " also your Charity (*devotion*) will over-
 " see or be the Bishop of the Church of
 " *Syria*.

Let us now sum up this other Evidence
 that has been brought to confirm Episcopal
 Government. *St. Paul* in his declining years
 (for he calls himself *Paul* the Aged, in his
 Letter to *Philemon*, from *Rome*, which he
 wrote before this to *Titus*) taking care for
 the good Government of the Churches after
 he was dead, about the same time that he
 desir'd *Timothy* to reside at *Ephesus* to over-
 see that Church, left *Titus* also at *Crete*, to
 superintend there when he was gone; that's
 to say, to set in order not only the necessary
 but convenient things, whatever was want-
 ing unto good Order, particularly to ordain
 and constitute Elders in every City of that
 Island, as occasion required. Not long after
 the Apostle had thus appointed, even when
 he was ready to sail over into *Italy* from *Epi-
 rus*, he wrote *Titus* a Letter, putting him in
 remembrance of the Trust aforesaid commit-
 ted to him, and moreover furnish'd him with
 several other Directions about the Discharge
 of his Office. From all which we learn, that
Titus was by *St. Paul* invested with Power to
 set

set in order whatever was lacking in the Churches of *Crete*, and to ordain and constitute Elders in every City (chap. 1. 5.) To take special care that such Elders were duly qualified for the Work committed to 'em (v. 6, 7, 8, 9.) To stop the mouths, that's to say, to silence unruly Elders and vain Talkers and Deceivers (v. 10, 11.) Also to rebuke 'em, and that sharply, cuttingly (v. 13.) That he might be sure to make 'em sensible of their Faults, and to rebuke with all Authority (chap. 2. 15.) Finally, if this did not prevail, then after such a Rebuke or Admonition given the second time, to suspend, remove, or excommunicate the obstinate Heretick (chap. 3. 10.)

This was the Church-Government in *Crete*, under *Titus* (the Bishop thereof I mean) invested with the same Power that Bishops at this day claim and exercise. Add hereunto, that *Ignatius*, together with St. *John*, have witnessed the like of nine of the most eminent Churches in the *Lesser Asia*: Yea the said holy Bishop of *Antioch* affirms these Bishops to have been *everywhere throughout the World* where the Gospel was profest. And all this was true about ten years after the death of St. *John* the Apostle, too small a time for Church-Government to have been so universally altered. And it is very hard, yea impossible, to imagine that this kind of Government, so soon and so universally practis'd, should have any other Foundation or Rise
but

but the Institution of the Apostles. If the Presbyterian Government had been set up by the Apostles, or by any of them, how could *Ignatius* have said, *That Bishops* (distinct from Presbyters) *were appointed throughout the world?* How happens it that there were no Churches, nor the Elders of any Churches, that were able to prevent or shake off the Episcopal Tyranny and Usurpation? And farther, if the kind of Government was left indifferent by the Apostles, 'tis very wonderful we should here meet with ten eminent Churches all presided over by Bishops, under them by Presbyters, under both by Deacons, and that the People should be under all these three degrees of Ministers, and not one Church in these parts, nor in any quarter of the World, found to be govern'd by Elders in a parity.

But to return to *Timothy* and *Titus*, there is not any one thing deliver'd in any History, whether Sacred or Profane, more clear, than that the supreme if not the sole Government of the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, was lodg'd in these two Persons, and that *Paul* rely'd upon their Care and Integrity in the Government of them, which is manifest from these four Observations more:

1. That the Apostle sometimes speaks unto 'em after the most endearing manner he could devise, calling them his *Sons* (*1 Tim.* 1. 2. 18. *2 Tim.* 1. 2. --- *2. 1.* and *Tit.* 1. 4.) If it be ask'd why *Paul* calls *Timothy* Son, I answer,

1. Not

1. Not according to Nature, that's manifest.
2. Not because *Paul* converted him to the Faith, or baptized him ; for he was a Disciple before *Paul* knew him, *Acts* 16. 1.
3. Not because *Paul* ordain'd him : For the Presbyterians say, that the Elders ordain'd him. But this Pretence I have refuted, and therefore,
4. I do think *Paul* call'd him Son either because he ordain'd him, or because he appointed him his Successor over the Church of *Ephesus*, or for both Reasons. And the like must be thought of *Titus* his Son. This however is plain, that *Paul* by calling 'em his Sons intended to engage them to the Ministry he had committed to them. But lest this soft way of dealing with 'em might not effectually answer the Apostle's Design and End, he also,
 2. Uses his Apostolical Power over 'em, to quicken 'em in their Duty,——*This charge I commit unto thee* (1 Tim. 1. 18.) *I charge thee* (chap. 5. 21. chap 6. 13. 2 Epist. 4. 1.) But
 3. He backs his own Apostolical Authority with very dreadful Appeals unto God and Christ and the Holy Angels in the foresaid places——*I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels---* *I give thee charge in the sight of God and Christ Jesus.* And --- *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus.* But,
 4. Let it be noted in the last place, that all this while here is not one Exhortation, not one Instruction, not one Direction, not one Command given to the Presbytery, nor any

any share in the Government communicated to 'em or to any of 'em, no nor any mention made of 'em. All the Concern was intrusted with *Timothy* and *Titus* only, as far as we know. New Elders were to be ordain'd by *Timothy* and *Titus* only, not so much as *with* the laying on of the Hands of the Presbyteries. And what can all this signifie, but that these two were, if not the sole Governours of those Churches, at least the supreme and principal; and that this kind of Government was the Institution of God by the Apostle. For why else should he in so solemn a manner press the Duty upon *Timothy* in the Name of God, and Christ, and the Angels? And if the Elders at *Ephesus* and *Crete* were *Timothy's* and *Titus's* Peers, it was a fatal, yea sinful Omission in *Paul*, not to communicate the same to them also: For surely these other Elders must need it, as well as these two, and more than they, if they were the most eminent: At least he ought to have directed *Timothy* and *Titus* to take 'em along with 'em in all these publick Acts of Jurisdiction. I do not pretend hence utterly to preclude the Presbyters of the Churches from all Interest in the Government. That they had some Power (though subordinate) is manifest from the Council at *Jerusalem* (*Acts* 15.) even with the Apostles themselves; doubtless then and much more with *Timothy* and *Titus*. And besides, *Ignatius*, as appears above, allows 'em a great stroke in ordering the Affairs
of

of their Churches, but still in Subjection to their Bishop, without whom, or against whose Consent, whoever does any thing (as *Ignatius* tells us) he does *the work of the Devil*. *S. Paul* in somewhat a softer Word calls it the Work of the Flesh, I mean, Schism, *Gal. 5. 20.*

To conclude, we affirm, and think we have sufficiently prov'd, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were, though not Bishops in Title, yet, Diocesan Governours, which is the same thing; and we plead that those excellent Persons whom we call Bishops at this day are no more, neither ought to be less.

But if the Title of Bishop will not be admitted as peculiar to them, let it be *Anathema maranatha*. If the Presbyterians have taken such a Disgust and Aversion unto the Word, we are content they should be call'd Overseers, Superintendents, Proveditors, Supervisors, Presbyters or Com-Presbyters, yea Deacons or Ministers, always provided they may be allow'd to have the same Place and Authority among us as *Timothy* had at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*. This we must insist upon as being an Apostolical and Scriptural Institution and Practice; and more I am persuaded the Reverend Bishops will not contend for. This only is evident, that if what we call Bishop is a distinct Office in the Church, it ought to have some peculiar Name or Title to distinguish it from other.

C H A P. III.

Of the time of Paul's constituting Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete.

ONE, and the leading Argument for *Timothy's* being Bishop of *Ephesus* (in the Sense we use that word at this day) is grounded on the 1 Epist. to *Tim.* 1. 3. where *Paul* puts him in remembrance, that—*he besought him to abide still at Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia.*

But the Dissenters, to avoid the Argument built upon this passage, and the rest of the Epistle, say, that they reading in the *Acts* (Chap. 16. and Chap. 20. v. 13.) that *Paul* went once, and again, and again into *Macedonia*, before he call'd the Elders of *Ephesus* to meet him at *Miletus* (*Acts* 20.) but never after, must conclude that *Paul besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus*, before he took leave of the *Ephesian Elders* at *Miletus*, and by consequence wrote the first Epistle to *Timothy* before that time, and therefore not mentioning the Bishop at *Miletus*, but committing the Flock to the Elders, he never made *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus*, but only in the Person of *Timothy*, gave orders how all
Elders

Elders were to demean themselves in the oversight they took of the Flock of Christ. Until then we demonstrate, *That Paul besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus*, and wrote that first Epistle to *Timothy*, at some other time of *his going into Macedonia*, we must expect nothing but perpetual noise and wrangling. 'Tis the thing I aim at in this Chapter, and am in great Hopes I can satisfy any one in this point, who will take the pains, as he reads, to turn to the Scriptures, as they are alledged to this purpose. I could wish also he would lay before him the Map of *Paul's* peregrination, if he be not pretty well skill'd in the Geography of those Cities and Countries I must mention, whilst I treat of this Argument. It must be confess'd, I am beholden unto that great Man *Dr. John Pearson*, late Bishop of *Chester*, for what I pretend to say on this hitherto obscure Passage of *Paul's Journey into Macedonia, when he besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus*. That Miracle of his Time in his *Annales Paulini*, has given us a plain account and proof thereof. All that I pretend unto is to build upon his Foundation, and to enlarge on what that excellent Prelate has demonstrated, in a few words, unto any observing Reader.

The Characteristick of the precise Time of *Paul's*, beseeching *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*, is set down by the Apostle himself in these words---*When I went into Macedonia* (1 Tim. 1. 3.) But when this was, is the Question. I will

will shew; 1. That it was not at any of those times of *Paul's* going into *Macedonia*, remembred in the *Acts*. 2. I will assign another, and the true time, and that was after the Apostle had the *Ephesians* farewell at *Miletus*. Unto which purposes we must, 1. Have recourse unto the History of *St. Paul* in the *Acts*; from whence it will appear beyond all controversie, that it was impossible, that he should have besought *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*, at any of his Voyages to *Macedonia*, spoken of in that History. And then, 2. We must search into *Paul's* Epistles; from whence it will be made evident, that there was another time, when he went into *Macedonia*, and appointed *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus*, even after his Release from his Imprisonment at *Rome*, which was about four Years at least, after he took leave of the *Ephesian* Elders at *Miletus*, as I guess.

As to the former, let it be remembred, that *St. Paul* was first acquainted with *Timothy* at *Derbe*, and *Lystra*, (*Acts* 16.1.) whence he took *Timothy* and *Silas* along with him, as he was going to confirm the Churches which he had lately planted in several parts of *Asia* the less, and some Islands adjoining. They are exactly set down in Chapters 13, 14. but *Crete* is not among them. These three, *Paul*, *Silas*, and *Timothy*, leaving *Derbe* and *Lystra*, went through the Cities, (v. 4.) where he had built the Churches aforesaid. After this they went through *Phrygia* and *Galatia* (ch. 16.6.)

16.6.) thence to *Mysia* (v.7.) thence to *Troas* (v.8.) a Sea-port Town looking towards *Macedonia*. Here it was said to *Paul* in a Vision, --come over into *Macedonia* and help us (v.9.) From *Troas* therefore *Paul* and *Timothy* with him sail'd to *Samothrace* (v.11.) an Island in the way between *Troas* and *Macedonia*. The next day they landed at *Neapolis* (v.11.) a City at the Entrance into *Macedonia*; thence went to *Philippi* (v.12.) the *Metropolis* of that part of *Macedonia*. Now *Paul*, as he went to *Macedonia* this time, could not have besought *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*. For *Timothy* went with *Paul* into *Macedonia* (Acts 16.3.) which will farther appear, as we follow *Paul* in his Journeys afterwards, through this Country and *Greece*. Besides, as yet, *Paul* had not been at *Ephesus*; nor were there any Christians there as yet (Acts 16.6. ch.18.19.) From *Philippi* *Paul* went through *Amphipolis*, and *Apollonia*, unto *Thessalonica* (ch.17.1.) thence to *Berea* (v.10.) where *Timothy* was left behind (v.14, 15.) From *Berea* toward the Sea (v.14.) and so to *Athens* (v.15,16.) thence to *Corinth* (ch.18.1.) where *Timothy* overtook *Paul* (v.5.) As he sailed back from *Corinth* to *Syria* (v.18.) he took *Ephesus* in his way (v.19.) being the first time he was ever there. Thence he departed unto *Casarea* (v.22.) but whether he left *Timothy* now at *Ephesus* is not material; Because *Paul* at this time went not to *Macedonia*, but to *Casarea*, the clean contrary way. From
Cesa-

Cæsarea Paul went to Antioch (v. 22.) thence into Galatia and Phrygia (v. 23.) thence to Ephesus again (ch. 19. 1.) Here Paul purposed to go again to Macedonia (v. 21.) but sent Timothy before (v. 22.) Paul shortly after followed Timothy into Macedonia (ch. 20. 1.) and therefore besought not Timothy at this time to abide at Ephesus. From Macedonia Paul went into Greece (v. 2.) thence back into Macedonia (v. 3.) Timothy accompanying him (v. 4.) From thence Timothy sail'd unto Troas before Paul, and tarry'd for him there (v. 5.) Paul passing through Macedonia and Philippi, overtook Timothy at Troas (v. 5, 6.) Thence Paul went to Assos and Mitylene (v. 14.) thence by Chios unto Samos, and Trogillum, and so to Miletus (v. 15.) refusing for hast to go to Ephesus (v. 16.) Here at Miletus he sent for the Ephesian Elders, of whom he took leave in a pathetical Discourse. Hereby then it is demonstrated, that Paul could not have besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia at any of these times, nor at any other time during the History of the Acts, the rest of that Book being spent in the relation of Paul's Journey to Jerusalem, his Imprisonment there, his Voyage to Rome and Imprisonment there two whole Years. But when Paul besought him to abide at Ephesus, as he went into Macedonia, must be shewn out of some of his Epistles.

Paul being now at Rome was held Prisoner (Acts 28. 16.) for two Years (v. 30.) Du-

ring which time he wrote Letters to several Churches, that he had planted in the East.

As, 1. To the *Philippians*, unto whom he mentions his Bonds (*ch. 1. 7, 13, 14, 16.*) That he wrote this Epistle from *Rome*, is manifest in that he speaks of the Palace or Emperour's Court (*ch. 1. 13.*) and *Cesar's* Household (*ch. 4. 22.*) Nor could this be wrote at his Imprisonment there (for such at present I suppose) Because at the second Imprisonment he suffer'd Martyrdom; but at the writing of this Epistle to the *Philippians* he expected Deliverance, and hop'd to see 'em shortly (*ch. 1. 25, 26. ch. 2. 24.*) Besides, *Timothy* was with him at the writing hereof (*ch. 1. 1. ch. 2. 19.*) But *Timothy* was not with him at his Imprisonment, when he wrote the second Epistle to *Timothy*. Lastly, he was once set at liberty (*Hcb. 13. 24.*) For he mentions here the Saints of *Italy*, not precisely of *Rome*; whence it seems very probable, that he was now set at liberty, and had withdrawn himself from *Rome* to some other parts, expecting *Timothy* to come to him from *Rome*, *v. 23.* Therefore he was twice imprison'd at *Rome*, and therefore in the first wrote this Epistle to the *Philippians*.

2. He wrote likewise to the *Colossians*, where in we read of his Afflictions (*ch. 1. 24.*) of his Bonds (*ch. 4. 3, 18.*) and of his being a Prisoner (*v. 10.*) This Letter was wrote from *Rome* at *Paul's* first Imprisonment there, for reasons

reasons that shall be drawn from that other Epistle to *Philemon*. Wherefore,

3. He sent also a Letter to *Philemon*, wherein he calls himself a Prisoner (vers. 1. 23.) speaks of his Bonds (vers. 18. 13.) This must have been written at *Paul's* first Imprisonment at *Rome*, because he had hopes to be set at liberty suddenly, and therefore bespeaks a Lodging to be provided him by *Philemon* (vers. 22.) But *Paul*, the second time he was at *Rome*, neither was, nor expected to be set at Liberty (2 *Tim.* 4. 6.) Taking it therefore for granted that this Letter was then wrote from *Rome*, to *Philemon* at *Coloss*, it will follow, that the Epistle to the *Colossians* was also then wrote; because 'tis plain *Philemon* was an Inhabitant of that City; and more especially because *Tychicus*, who carry'd that to the *Colossians*, had *Onesimus* for his Companion (chap. 4. 7, 8, 9.) Now this *Onesimus* was *Philemon's* Servant (or Slave) and running away from him, wander'd as far as *Rome*, where *Paul* lighting on him, converted him, and sent him back to his Master with that Letter. Moreover *Timothy* was with *Paul* at the writing of both Epistles, *Philem.* vers. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. as also was *Epaphras*, *Phil.* vers. 23. *Col.* 4. 12. So was one *Marcus*, *Phil.* 24. *Col.* 4. 10. So was *Aristarchus*, *Phil.* 24. *Col.* 4. 10. who accompanied *Paul* from *Jerusalem* to *Rome*, *Acts* 27. 2. *Demas* also and *Luke*, *Phil.* 24. *Col.* 4. 14. Lastly, *Archippus* at *Coloss* then, *Phil.* 2. *Col.* 4. 17. So then the matter stands

G 3

thus:

thus: *St. Paul* a Prisoner at *Rome*, but hoping for Deliverance in a short time, sent *Philemon* a Letter by *Onesimus*; but at the same time another by *Tychicus* to the *Colossians*, in Company with *Onesimus*. If then the Letter to *Philemon* was wrote from *Rome* in *Paul's* first Imprisonment, so must that to the *Colossians* have been.

4. He wrote another Epistle to the *Hebrews* before he left *Italy*. He therein puts 'em in mind of his *Adversity and Bonds* (chap. 13. 3.) He exhorts 'em to pray for him, that he might be restor'd to 'em the sooner (vers. 18. 19.) He promises to visit them (vers. 23.) All which manifests his Purpose to return unto *Judea*. Moreover, he was in *Italy* at the Writing hereof, (vers. 24.) This therefore was written immediately after he had been set at Liberty and still in *Italy*, and therefore just after his first Imprisonment.

5. And Lastly, He also wrote to the *Ephesians*, and calls himself a Prisoner (chap. 3. 1. and chap. 4. 1.) and an Ambassador of Christ in Bonds (chap. 6. 20.) and intimates his Tribulations (chap. 3. 13.) 'Tis true, all this might have been said at any other time of his Imprisonment: but that he wrote this Epistle from *Rome* at his first Confinement there, appears, 1. Because the ancient Author of the Subscription attests, that *Paul* was then at *Rome*. 2. Because *Tychicus*, who carry'd the Epistle to the *Colossians* (chap. 4. 7.) was also the Bearer of this to the *Ephesians* (chap. 6. 21.)

6. 21.) And 3. Because both this Epistle to the *Ephesians*, and that to the *Colossians*, are in Matter and in Phrase so very like one another, that in all reason it must be thought that both dropt from the Mind and Pen of the Apostle about the same time; I had almost said the same day, and perhaps were in a great part transcrib'd one from the other: e. g. St. Paul (*Eph. 6. 21.*) thus commends *Tychicus* — a beloved Brother and faithful Minister in the Lord. And (*Col. 4. 7.*) thus, — a beloved Brother, and faithful Minister, and Fellow-servant in the Lord. But above all, let any one compare the 5th and 6th Chapters of the Epistle to the *Ephesians* with the 3d and 4th to the *Colossians*, and he'll be forc'd to confess, that the same Thoughts, Words, and Phrases were in the Mind of the Apostle, as well when he wrote the one as the other; which is not probable should have been, if he had wrote that to *Coloss* at his first Imprisonment, and that other to *Ephesus* some years after, in his second Imprisonment.

From what has been observ'd out of these Epistles to the *Philippians*, *Colossians*, *Ephesians*, *Philemon*, and the *Hebrews*, we have gain'd this Point (as may reasonably be suppos'd) that *Paul*, after his Release from his first Imprisonment at *Rome*, went back to visit the Eastern Churches. Being then at length loose in *Italy* (*Heb. 13. 24.*) he sail'd thence to *Crete* (for that's the way by Sea from *Italy*

to *Judaea* (*Acts* 27. 7, 12, 13.) Here, in his Passage, *Paul* 'tis likely, planted a Church in *Crete*: For no other time can be assign'd for it but this. In all *St. Paul's* Travels, so exactly reckon'd in the *Acts* until he was sent Prisoner to *Rome*, he never is said to have been at *Crete*. At *Cyprus* he was, and several other Islands, but we hear nothing of his going unto *Crete*, the noblest of 'em all. This then may be allowed to be the time of *Paul's* settling a Church in *Crete*, viz. as he sail'd from *Italy* to *Judaea*. But because he had not time to perfect the Work, he left *Titus* there (*chap.* 1. 5.) with Instructions and Power to finish and to preside over it; and some time after wrote to him upon the same Subject from *Nicopolis*, or thereabouts (*chap.* 3. 12.) From *Crete*, very probably, he went for *Judaea*; for so he had promis'd to do (*Heb* 13. 23.) Having visited the Churches there and in *Syria*, he bent his Course towards *Asia the Less*, and thence into *Macedonia*, as he had promis'd in his Epistle to *Philemon* and the *Philippians*. Hitherto we have built upon Conjecture, ever since we brought him from *Italy*; nevertheless 'tis clear, that he was in several places within the foresaid Provinces in this his Return Eastward, as will be manifest from *2 Tim.* *chap.* 4. For he says, that he left *Trophimus* sick at *Miletum*, which *Dr. Heylin* places in *Crete*: Be it so; 'tis the same thing to my Hypothesis. It follows notwithstanding, that *St. Paul*, after his Release from his
first

first Imprisonment at *Rome*, went back to the East; and especially, if *Miletum* in the second Epistle to *Timothy* be the same as that in the twentieth of the *Acts*, as is most likely. For then it must be observed, that when *Paul* left the Ephesian Elders (*Acts* 20.) *Trophimus* went along with him to *Jerusalem* (*Acts* 21. 29.) and very likely to *Rome* also (as did *Timothy*, whom we find with *Paul* there (*Philip.* 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. *Heb.* 13. 23.) *Paul* leaving *Miletus* went to *Troas* (*2 Tim.* 4. 13.) where he left his Cloke, his Books and his Parchments. Now *Troas* was the Port, from whence *Paul* was wont to sail from *Asia* unto *Macedonia*, as has been already related. From *Troas*, then he once more sail'd to *Nicopolis*, as is very probable; thence to *Philippi*, as he had oft before done, and as he had promised once more to do (*Philip.* 2. 24.) From *Philippi* he went to *Corinth*. There we find him (*2 Tim.* 4. 20.) From *Corinth* to *Nicopolis*, † where *Titus* was to meet him (*cb.* 3. 12.) from whence he crost the Sea to *Italy* the second time, as is probable.

† *Nicopolis* a City on the West of the *Ambracian Bay* looking toward *Italy*.

The Reader has (I imagine) already prevented me, and found where and when *St. Paul* went to *Macedonia* after he had besought *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*. Where? but at *Troas*; and when? but as he was taking Ship there this last time for *Macedonia*? *methinks*, Just as I was going to *Macedonia* I besought thee to abide at
Ephe-

Ephesus. In a word, *Paul*, when he was about *Nicopolis*, wrote his first Epistle to *Timothy*, as I suppose, and that to *Titus* (ch. 3. 12.) both upon the same Subject. But how long it was e'er *Paul* was again imprisoned at *Rome*, and again wrote to *Timothy*, I find nothing to ground a solid conjecture on, nor is it material to the Controversie in hand. All the Fathers say, and the Learned do hold, that some time or other he went to *Spain*, and to the remotest Parts of the West, even unto *Britain* it self †. Which if it be true, must have been after his return to the West this second time. But in

† As the Bishop of *Worc.*
Orig. Britan.
thinks.

the end he went, or was carryed to *Rome*, from whence he wrote his second Epistle unto *Timothy* then at *Ephesus*.

Upon the whole matter, then, I do think it plain, that *Paul* when he had planted a Church at *Ephesus*, first govern'd it himself by the Presbyters in his absence, who were responsible to him. This continu'd so long as he was vigorous and active, and had opportunity to over-see both the Flock and the Elders themselves. But after his first Imprisonment at *Rome*, and return into the East, being *Paul the Aged* (*Philem.* 9.) and now Errors, and Heresies, and Schisms, and Emulations growing up among 'em (*2 Tim.* 4. 3, 4. ch. 3.) as also being about to leave these Eastern-parts, and to go far into the West, where he could not have opportunity to govern

vern 'em, He therefore constituted *Timothy* chief Governour of that Church, committing unto him all the principal Powers and Authorities, belonging to that Office, in his first Epistle to *Timothy*. But afterwards seeing himself appointed unto Death, surrendred it intirely up unto him in those

words--*Watch thou in all things, endure Afflictions, do the Work of an Evangelist, make full proof thy Ministry*

(2 Tim. 4. 5, 6.) *For I am ready to be offer'd, &c.* Which last words are the

reason of his former Admonition unto *Timothy*, to the Discharge of his Office, and intimates that *Paul*, now, being ready to be offer'd, deliver'd up to *Timothy* the intire and sole Care of the Ephesian Church.

All which suites excellent well with that noted passage of St. *Jerom* upon the Epistle to *Titus* — “ Presbyter and Bishop (*says he*)

“ were the same thing, before Schisms arose in

“ Religion by the Devil's instigation; and be-

“ fore the People cry'd out, one, I am of *Paul*,

“ another, I am of *Apollos*, and a third, I am of

“ *Cephas*, Churches were govern'd by the com-

“ mon Council of the Presbyters (*yet in sub-*

“ *ordination to the Apostles I presume:*) But

“ after that, every (*Presbyter*) claim'd all

“ those as his own, whom he had baptized,

“ and not Christ's; it was decreed *through-*

“ *out the World* (*as Ignatius asserts in his Epi-*

“ *stle to the Ephesians*) that one elected out

“ of the Presbyters should be set over the

“ rest, .

“ rest, unto whom the care of the Church
 “ should belong, and that the Seeds of Schism
 “ should be taken away. But when was this
 decreed? It was thus decreed before *Ignati-*
us flourish’d: therefore in the Days of the
 Apostles; therefore by them. The very oc-
 casion of this Universal Decree, as ’tis exprest
 by *Jerom*, shews as much, viz. because (1 Cor.
 1. 12. ch. 3. 4.) *one said I am of Paul, &c.*
 Doubtless, *Paul* was as much concern’d at the
 Corinthian Schisms as any other: He had rea-
 son for it. For they despis’d and cast him off,
 and threw off the Tyranny (as they counted
 it) of his Apostolical Authority. The Apo-
 stle, doubtless then, seeing Divisions arising
 every where (not only at *Corinth*) weighed
 the matter well, and ask’d Counsel of God
 what he should do. And in the end conclu-
 ded (all the World agreeing thereto accord-
 ing to *Ignatius* and *Jerom*) to set one Pres-
 byter over the rest to prevent the Mischief of
 Schism, God so appointing it, 1 Tim. 1. 18.

Before I end this Chapter, I must explain
 and clear some things, that will be brought
 into question. I would not interrupt my self
 nor my Reader with much Controversie,
 whilst I was laying the matter of Fact in a
 very plain and easie View before him: but
 here I take my self oblig’d to vindicate what-
 ever I can foresee, may with any colour of
 pretense be question’d.

Some difficulty may be made, whether *Ti-*
mothy was at *Éphesus*, when *St. Paul* wrote
 his

his second Epistle to him. There are Reasons (I am sensible) why the Presbyterians will think themselves oblig'd to deny it. But,

In the first place, it is their part to shew, where he was (if not at *Ephesus*) We read not of his removal unto any other place; which if it had been, one would think St. *Paul*, in this Epistle, would have given us some hint of it; which was not needful to do, if he abode there still. It ought then in reason to be presum'd, that *Paul* wrote the second time to him at *Ephesus*. For the Apostle besought him, *ἐπεκρίνω*, to reside there. The Apostle after that, wrote the first Epistle to him, and was then thinking himself to go to *Ephesus*, (1 *Ep.* 3. 14.) but was uncertain (v. 15.) And therefore adds—*till I come* (ch. 4. 13.) Now, because *Paul* never went to *Timothy* at *Ephesus*; and because *Timothy* was to tarry there *till Paul came* (or sent to him) for St. *Paul* is wont to say, he came to the Churches when he only sent Letters or Messengers to 'em (2 *Cor.* 12. 14. ch. 13. 1.) We therefore ought to grant that *Timothy* was now at *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote the second time unto him, and sent for him to *Rome*. Moreover,

2. St. *Paul* mentions *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* in both Epistles (1 *Tim.*

Dr. *Lightfoot* 1. 20. 2 *Tim.* 2. 17. & ch. 4. 14.)
Vol. 1. 324. Now 'tis not to be imagin'd that both the Hereticks, and *Timothy* also, should be removed to one and the same place.

3. St.

3. St Paul thus writes to *Timothy*—*this thou knowest, that all they in Asia turn'd away from me* (2 Ep. i. 15.) in likelyhood return'd back into their own Country, whereof *Ephesus* was a principal City. If so, then *Timothy* might well know of it, when he had resided at *Ephesus* so long, and was yet there.

4. *Troas* was the common way from *Ephesus* to *Macedonia*, and so to *Italy* and *Rome*. 'Tis likely then that *Timothy* being sent for to *Rome*, would go from *Ephesus* to *Troas* (that is, *Paul* thought so,) and thence to bring along with him the Apostle's Cloke, his Books, and his Parchments.

Dr. Lightfoot
Id. ibid.

Dr. Lightfoot
adds there a 5th
(his 3d) Argument,
vi. because
Paul salutes the
Household of O-

nesiphorus, ch. 4. 10. who was an *Ephesian*, ch. i. 18.

These are not ('tis true) concluding Arguments, but an obstinate Man may reject 'em Nevertheless, I hold 'em good enough, till the Presbyterians bring better to prove he was not at *Ephesus*, but at some other place. For as for *Paul's* telling *Timothy*—*Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus* (chap. 4. 12.) the meaning is (not that *Paul* tells it him for News, as if he were in some other place, and knew it not; but,) *I send for thee to Rome, because all but Luke are gone from me, and Tychicus I have now sent to Ephesus. Thou must then needs come unto me.* Besides, it is a common thing to write to one's Correspondent, e. g. at London

London—I have sent my Servant A. B. to *London*; yea, tho' that Servant be the Bearer of the Letter. Of this more afterwards.

Some, in the next place, will deny that *Paul* was twice imprison'd at *Rome*, and so overthrow the whole Hypothesis: For it must then be granted, that he besought *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus* at some other time of his going into *Macedonia*, and before he met the *Ephesian* Elders at *Miletus* unless he was twice imprison'd: For 'tis plain, that after he left *Miletus*, he made directly for *Jerusalem*, and there was made a Prisoner, and from thence sail'd unto *Rome*, and (as some say) never came thence; and if so, my whole Argument is lost.

I am oblig'd then, and do think I can demonstrate beyond all farther Controversie, that *Paul* was twice Prisoner at *Rome*. The first is spoken of in Chap. 28. of the *Acts*; the second, in the 2 Ep. to *Timothy*. Wherefore,

1. *Trophimus* was with *Paul* at *Miletus*, when the Apostle met the *Ephesian* Elders (*Acts*. 20 4.) and from thence accompany'd *Paul* to *Jerusalem* (chap. 21. 29.) This then could not be the time that *Paul* left *Trophimus* sick at *Miletus*, mention'd 2 *Tim*. 4. 20. And if this *Miletum* were a City of *Crete* (as *Bezylin*† thinks) it must however be suppos'd, that *Paul* was enlarg'd from his Imprisonment, and was gotten back as far as *Malta*, or

† As does *Effius* also: but *Grossius* and *Zeza* understand the Island of *Malta*.

Cress

Crete towards the East and *Judaea*, and that he must therefore of necessity have been imprison'd a second time at *Rome*, when he wrote his second Epistle to *Timothy*. Nor does *Paul* tell it to *Timothy* as a piece of News not yet known to him——that he had left *Trophymus* at *Miletum* sick, but only uses it for a Motive, why *Timothy* should come to him at *Rome*, he being now by one Accident or other depriv'd of all his Friends, Assistants, and Fellow Labourers (except *Luke*) even of *Trophymus* himself (2 Tim. 4. 20)

2. It is pretty plain, that *Paul* was once releas'd from Prison (*Heb.* 13.) in that he wrote that Epistle from *Italy* (vers. 24.) not from *Rome* in *Italy*; because he then expected *Timothy* should be set at Liberty and come unto him (vers. 23.) which shews that *Paul* himself was at Liberty, and then abiding (not at *Rome*, but) at some other place in *Italy*. And altho' the Apostle mentions his Bonds (chap. 10. 34.) and also seems to speak of 'em (chap. 13. 3.) Yet the former words refer to some time past, 'tis likely his Bonds in *Jerusalem* of which the *Hebrews* had been Eye-Witnesses; the latter is only a general Exhortation to the Remembrance of (all) those that are in Bonds: For if he had meant himself at that time, he should have said as he did (*Col.* 4. 18.) ——Remember my bonds. If then the Apostle was once set at Liberty, he must have been twice imprison'd. As for the 19th vers. of *Heb.* 13. where *Paul* beseeches them to pray for
b.m,

him, that he might be restor'd to 'em the sooner, it imports only, that he might have a prosperous and speedy Voyage to *Judea*. But,

3. That which will put the Matter out of all question is, the vast Difference between that his Imprisonment, which is describ'd in the 28th. chap. of the *Acts*, and that which is describ'd in the second Epistle to *Timothy*. He became a Prisoner at first only upon the Accusation of the *Jews* his Country-men; he was by the *Roman* Governors found to have done nothing worthy of Death (*Acts* 25. 25.) And had he not unhappily appeal'd unto *Cesar*, he had been set at Liberty (*Acts* 26. 32.) And for this Reason alone he was to go unto *Cesar* (*Acts* 25. 12). In short, the *Roman* Governors look'd upon the Quarrel between *Paul* and the *Jews* to have risen only about their own Superstition (as they call'd it *Acts* 25. 19.) wherein the State was nothing concern'd. For which Reasons it was, that he was treated courteously in all his Voyage to *Rome*. He was permitted upon his Request to tarry seven days at *Puteoli* with the Brethren (chap. 28. 14.) The Brethren from *Rome* met him publickly in the way (v. 15.) *Paul* at *Rome* was suffer'd to dwell by himself, one Soldier only guarding him (v. 16.) He had freedom to assemble the *Jews* to him (v. 17) and again to have another Meeting with them (v. 23.) and finally, he dwelt two years in his own house, and receiv'd all that came in unto him, preaching the Kingdom of

H

God

God with all confidence, no man forbidding him (vers. 30, 31.) In two words, he was in little or no Danger, but held *liberâ custodiâ*; a great deal of Liberty was allow'd him. Nor is this to be wondred at: For the Roman Governors doubtless represented him innocent unto *Caesar*, as they had found him; and he saith somewhat better, without question, for being born a Free-man.

But on the other hand, 'twas quite contrary in that Imprisonment spoken of in the second Epistle to *Timothy*; 'Twas *arctâ custodiâ*: He was closely confin'd, and in extreme danger; (For that now (as I shall shew anon) he was taken for a Conspirator against the Civil Government.) He therefore blest Onesiphorus for refreshing him in Prison, and daring to own him, and not being asham'd of his Chain (2 Tim. i. 16.) Whereas before, all the Brethren would him publicly, were not asham'd of him, flock'd about him, and conducted him into the City. In short, this continu'd at least two Years. But he adds of Onesiphorus—that he sought him out diligently, and found him with much difficulty (v. 17.) which does not at all agree with his other Imprisonment. Besides, he intimates his Danger unto *Timothy*, when he thus exhorts him—he not thou asham'd of the Testimony of our Lord, nor of me his Prisoner. He thus writes, because he now sent for *Timothy* to Rome, and was concern'd lest *Timothy* might decline it, because of the Danger. Moreover, it appears, that he was
in

in great peril and hazard, because—*all Asia were turn'd away from him* (ch. 1. 15.) and *all men forsook him* (ch. 4. 16.) Nor did he expect deliverance at all (v. 6, 7, 8.) Whereas before he was all along in hopes of it, as is manifest, from what I have observed out of the Epistles. And although he comforts himself that—the *Lord would deliver him from every evil work* (ch. 4. 18.) he means not out of his present Danger, but out of all the *Evils* of this World; wherefore he adds—and will preserve me unto his heavenly Kingdom. In short, here he was brought to answer for himself, and hardly escap'd the Mouth of the *Lion* (v. 16, 17.) and no wonder, being accus'd as an Evil doer (ch. 2. 9.) or a Disturber of the Government, and publick Peace; Perhaps the *Roman* Gentiles were now become sensible how much an Enemy he was to their Idolatrous Religion, and for that reason also vigorously prosecuted him. Whereas before it was the Jews only, who accus'd him at *Jerusalem*; but let it drop when he was sent to *Rome*. So that all this duly consider'd, I take my self to have demonstrated, that *Paul* was twice imprison'd, the former describ'd, *Acts* 28. and the latter in the second Epistle to *Timothy*.

It may not be amiss here to add a short Account of *St. Paul's* Martyrdom, out of the the Bishop of *Chester's* Annals, the better to confirm some things observ'd of *Paul's* second Imprisonment.

Nero (as his Lordship supposes, with great reason) had rais'd a Persecution against the Christians three Years (or thereabouts) before *Paul's* second Imprisonment. For the Emperor going into *Greece*, and the Persecution ceasing, *Paul* went to *Rome* as a place of security. There he found another *Nero*, viz. *Helius Casarianus*, whom the Emperor had adopted his Partner, giving him full Power over all *Italy*, to confiscate Estates, to proscribē, banish and slay whomsoever he pleas'd of the People, Knights and Senators, without consulting *Nero* (*Dio* lib. 63. pag. 720.) Now it was that St. *Paul* was thrown into close Prison, and brought to answer for himself, before that *Lyon Helius Casarianus*. The Apostle calls it his first Answer, or Defence. After which the Apostle wrote his second Epistle. 'Tis not to be wonder'd that *Paul* should at this time suffer Imprisonment: For a Conspiracy was then laid against *Nero*, which caus'd *Helius* to hasten to him in *Greece*, with design to bring him back unto *Italy*. In the Month of *January* they arriv'd at *Naples* in *Campania*, and the same Day *Nero* murder'd his Mother (*Sueton.* c. 43.) and the 22th of *February* following *Paul* was beheaded, reckon'd perhaps among the Conspirators, or Evil-doers. On the Ninth of *June* following *Nero* slew himself.

Now, whereas *Paul* calls it ἀπολογία, his first Answer, it must be meant of his first Answer made at his second Imprisonment.

For

For, *St. Luke* could not have omitted this Answer if it had happen'd, when he was first a Prisoner at *Rome* (*Acts 28.*) And though a first Answer supposes one more at the least, it may as well be admitted that the Apostle (when he wrote to *Timothy*) expected to make another Answer, though the History reaches not so far, as that he made any at all in that Imprisonment recorded *Acts 28.* In a word, let it but be well observed, how exactly every Circumstance of *Paul's* Story agrees unto the Supposition of two Imprisonments, and little reason will be found to make any scruple of it. Whereas, it is impossible to reconcile many things with their Opinion, who affirm he was but once imprison'd at *Rome*.

In the next place, let us farther examine, when *Paul* wrote his Epistle to the *Ephesians*. They who assert, that he wrote it at the same time, that he wrote his second Epistle to *Timothy*, ground themselves on *eb. 4. 12.* of that Epistle, --- *Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus*, compar'd with *Eph. 6. 21, 22. Tychicus, whom I have sent unto you.* If then (they argue) *Timothy* was at this time Bishop of *Ephesus*, why did not *Paul* make some honourable mention of him to the *Ephesians*? Reply.

1. I have prov'd. that *Tychicus* carry'd the Epistle to the *Colossians* (*ch. 4. 7.*) and that that Epistle was wrote at *Paul's* first Imprisonment. It will then hence follow, that *Tychicus* was with the Apostle both times at *Rome*,

and that the Apostle might have written that Epistle to the *Ephesians* during his first Imprisonment, and afterward have sent again unto them during his second, viz. at the same time that he wrote the second to *Timothy*; So that at best 'tis but a Moot Question, whether *Paul* wrote to the *Ephesians* at his first or second Imprisonment. But over and besides what I have before argu'd, it is much more probable, that the Epistle to the *Ephesians* was wrote at *Paul's* first Imprisonment, because, though therein he calls himself a Prisoner, *ch.* 3. 1. *ch.* 4. 1. an Ambassador in bonds, *ch.* 6. 20. yet he speaks not of his great and imminent Dangers, as he does in his second to *Timothy*, which one cannot well imagine he would have omitted to have done, as well in that to the *Ephesians*, as in that to *Timothy*; especially, if (as the Objectors believe) *Timothy* was not then at *Ephesus*, but at some other place, and so could not acquaint the *Ephesians* with the Apostles present condition. But,

2. I will suppose that, *St. Paul* wrote his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, at the same time, that he wrote his second Epistle to *Timothy*, and that he sent 'em both by *Tychicus*; yet his making no honourable mention of *Timothy* in that to the *Ephesians*, is nothing against *Timothy's* being constituted Bishop there at that very time. For how fine soever this Argument may appear unto some; yet if it be narrowly look'd into, 'twill be found to have nothing
in

in it. For I do ask our Adversaries, why *St. Paul*, in that Epistle to the *Ephesians*, made no Honourable Remembrance of their Presbyters or Elders? Shall it be concluded that the Church of *Ephesus* had no Elders, because there's no mention of them in that Epistle? If it was fit that the Apostle should have saluted *Timothy* their Bishop, in case he was then Resident Bishop of *Ephesus*; 'twas altogether as fit he should have saluted the Presbytery, in case the supreme Power of the Church was then lodg'd in their hands. But because all will agree that there were Elders in the Church of *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote to the *Ephesians*, though he does not so much as name them, nor any one of 'em: So do we persist to affirm that *Timothy* might be Bishop of *Ephesus*, tho' *Paul* mention'd him not in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*. But of this more by and by:

One thing is worthy to be taken notice of, that the Apostles, when they wrote to the faithful, frequently omitted speaking any thing of the Church-officers. This must be confest true in that Epistle to the *Galatians*. *St. John* likewise in his first Epistle has not a Syllable of 'em, nor *Jude*, nor *Peter* in his second Epistle. *Ignatius* in his second Epistle to the *Romans* slips 'em all over; though he knew very well there was one then at *Rome*, seeing he had affirm'd in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, that Bishops were throughout the World. Lastly. *St. Paul* in his first Epistle to *Timothy*, and that to *Titus*, though he supposes

ses Elders there, because he directs *Timothy* and *Titus*, to ordain and to govern them, yet he makes no honourable mention of them, neither salutes them. That little intimation therefore given of 'em, is only due to the Argument of those Epistles; otherwise happily we had found as little of 'em in these Epistles, as in that to the *Galatians*. If then the Apostle's Silence is a good Argument against *Timothy's* being at *Ephesus*, or Bishop there, 'tis good against Elders being there. St. Paul *Ephes. 6. 23.* salutes the Brethren only, not the Elders nor *Timothy*. If it be gathered hence, that *Timothy* was not then at *Ephesus* nor Bishop thereof, I will take leave to collect, that that Church was at that time without Elders also.

Nay but it will be said, St. Paul in that Epistle to the *Ephesians* speaks of several kinds of Church Officers, of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers, (ch. 4. 11.) True, with reference to the Universal Church; not to that particular one of *Ephesus*. For if that Passage refer to the Church of *Ephesus*; as having all those Officers in it, then it had Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers; and so was not govern'd by Elders, but by several Orders superior to them. If it be said, that Elders are included in Pastors and Teachers: Then I desire to know why may not Bishop *Timothy* be included in Evangelists? For (as now 'tis suppos'd) he was at this time an Evangelist, (2. *Tim. 4. 5.*) and
an

an Evangelist was above a Pastor and Teacher. In fine, when ever *St. Paul besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus*, whenever he wrote the 1st. Epistle to him, (suppose before he wrote to the *Ephesians*; yea suppose before he bid the *Ephesian* Elders farewell at *Miletus* (*Acts* 20.) the Argument built upon the Apostles Silence, is as broad as long, as much against *Ephesian* Elders, as an *Ephesian* Bishop. If then I be ask'd why *Paul* mention'd not Bishop *Timothy* in his Speech to the *Ephesian* Elders (*Act*. 20.) nor in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*? I demand why did not *Paul* name the *Ephesian* Presbytery in his 1st. Epistle to *Timothy*, and the *Ephesian* Elders in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*? Or if *Timothy* was not at *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote the 2^d. Epistle, but in some other Place; Why did not the Apostle make remembrance of the Presbytery in that Place where ever it was? The Summ is, there is no force at all in the Objection, only it makes a noise among idle and undiscerning People.

But this I will add for a Conclusion, that when *Paul* wrote to the ordinary Brethren, there was far less reason to speak of Church Officers, (the design of the Epistles being for the Comfort and Edification of the common Believers) than when he wrote to *Timothy* the 1st. Epistle about ordering the Affairs of Church Government, which if he had log'd in the Hands of the Presbytery as Supreme, 'twas impossible he should altogether

ther have overlook'd 'em, as is manifest he did. Finally, whatever has been offer'd in proof of *Timothy's* being Bishop of *Ephesus* will serve (if rightly apply'd) to prove *Titus* also Bishop of *Crete*. For they must stand and fall together.

There remains yet one more rub in my way that is to be remov'd, and so I will conclude this Chapter. Mr. *Paul Bayn* *

†The *Diocesan's* argues against *Timothy's* being Bishop of *Ephesus* thus—

“It is not (*say's he*) like that
“*Timothy* was placed Bishop after *Paul's* being
“at *Rome*. For, when *Paul*, saith he, pray'd
“him (when now he was going to *Macedonia*)
“to stay at *Ephesus*, he doth intimate, that
“when he left him they were then both together.

Ans^r. The good Man's Imagination was all this while upon *Titus* 1. 5. as if *Paul* had left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, (For so he writes to *Titus*—For this cause I left thee in *Crete*,) and that both *Paul* and *Timothy* were there, when the Apostle besought him to abide at *Ephesus*. But 'tis nothing so. For *Paul* says not that he left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, but besought him to abide there; which *St. Paul* might have done, tho' neither of 'em had then been at *Ephesus*. I will suppose 'em both (as I have before conjectur'd) at *Troas*: Might not *Paul* have besought *Timothy* (at *Troas*) to (go and) abide at *Ephesus*? I see no absurdity in this. But however *Paul* at *Troas* might by Letter or Messenger, or both, have besought *Timothy* then at *Ephesus* to tarry

carry there, and then Mr. Bayne's Objection is at an end. For though *Timothy* was then there, it is not necessary that *Paul* was there also. But I will suppose that *Paul* also was then at *Ephesus*. Oh, by no means says Mr. Bayne. For in the next place say's he,

"When *Paul* wished *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*, he had a meaning to come unto *Timothy* there, where he left him, (1. *Tim.* 3. 14. and ch. 4. 13.) But *Paul* after his parting from the Elders of *Ephesus* knew he should never see the *Ephesians* more, nor they him, (*Acts* 20. 25.) To this I reply,

1. That the Words running thus—*ἵνα ὅτε δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν τὸ ἐγὼ μὴ μετὰ ὑμῶν μένειν*, ought to be render'd—I know that ye shall no more see my face all of you. The *ὑμῶν μένειν* being cast to the end of the period, seem to imply, that all of 'em should not see his face any more, tho' some of 'em might. And it is manifest some of 'em did. For when he was a Prisoner at *Rome* (which was long after he spake those Words to the *Ephesian* Presbyters) he complain'd to *Timothy*—that all they which are in *Asia* be turned away from me (2. *Tim.* 1. 15.) Now *Asia* comprehends properly all the Country about *Ephesus*: And it was not to the *Ephesian* Elders only that he made that Speech, but to the *Miletian* and all other Elders of *Asia*—ye know (say's he) from the first day that I came into *Asia*, after what manner I have been among you at all Seasons. But 'tis in no wise probable that all of 'em

'em saw his Face any more: Death and other Casualties of Providence would doubtless hinder it, seeing he was like to be absent long from 'em. In short, he might have gone once more to *Ephesus*, and yet not *all of them* see his Face any more. But not to insist on this.

2. It cannot be prov'd that *Paul* spake those Words peremptorily or of certain knowledg and by Prophecy, as if it had been absolutely determin'd and reveal'd by God. The foregoing Verses shew the contrary.—*I go unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things which shall befall me there, saving that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every City saying, that Bonds and Afflictions abide me.* He knew not then, but that he might be loosed out of his Bonds and be set at liberty again. Which if it happen'd, as for ought he knew might, how could he affirm that he knew of a surety they should see his Face no more? He could not know it by the Spirit; (for the Spirit witness'd no such thing) nor could he know it by his own Resolutions. (For it had been unkind and sinful for him thus to have resolv'd.) 'Twas therefore a conjectural knowledg only, or probable, grounded upon the Bonds and Afflictions, which the Spirit foretold did abide him, the issue whereof he knew not certainly, but fear'd the worst. And because things happen'd beyond expectation (as we have shew'd; for at *Rome* he was releas'd from his Bonds) he might well afterwards promise
and

and intend to go to *Ephesus*, tho' he before thought they should never see his Face any more.

To put an end then unto the Argument, seeing there is not one Instance to be found in Holy Scripture of ordinary Presbyters governing any Church, but with and under the conduct of the Apostles or some of 'em, not one clear Testimony of their ordaining Elders by Imposition of Hands, of their rebuking Publickly and with Authority, of their Suspending or Excommunicating Heretical Scandalous and Contumacious Elders, or, in a word, of doing any one Act of Ecclesiastical Power, by which they receiv'd special Orders far from some of the Apostles, seeing there is not in the Word of God any hint of the Apostles committing and leaving the Supreme Power to the Presbyteries, when themselves were going off the Stage. On the other hand, supposing that *Paul* once intrusted the *Ephesian* Elders with the joint Power of Ruling that Church, yet seeing it is manifest, he put the Government thereof into the Hands of *Timothy* afterwards, and committed the Care and Charge of the Church of *Crete* unto *Titus*, the Elders having no share (that we know of) in the most important Matters belonging to the Government of those Churches; seeing every thing of Moment was concredited unto these two Bishops so expressly, that if the Apostle had intended, what we say and believe he did, *viz.* to ap-
point

point, 'em the Supreme Governors of those Churches in his room, he could not well have spoken his Mind more plainly and particularly than he has done in his Epistles to them : It is extraordinary (I say) that after all this, Men can find shifts to evade such bright Evidences of Episcopal Government as are to be seen in the Holy Scriptures, or dare uphold a Schism upon this frivolous pretence, that the Apostle wrote those Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* only as Representatives of the Presbyters, to whom (as some Men would have it) the several Powers and Trusts therein mention'd do properly appertain. At this rate the Apostle might as well have superscrib'd those Letters to *John an Oke* and *John a' Stiles*. But certainly it had been easie for *St. Paul* to have wrote unto the Presbyteries, if that had been his intention, to have impower'd them to perform the Acts of Jurisdiction spoken of in those Epistles, and not left us so in the dark to grope our way, and find out Presbyters and Elders where they are not once nam'd as to any Authority committed to 'em. In short, had the Apostle intended, as I said (let me desire the Presbyterians but to suppose it) to have constituted *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops, he could have wrote no otherwise, than he has written ; and therefore because he has written as he has done, we may well judge he intended them for Bishops. For I will appeal to our Dissenting Brethren themselves, whether if, what the Apostle gave in charge so expressly to *Timothy* and *Titus*,
 he

he had committed to the Elders, as he might easily have done, (I am sure the word *Πρεσβυτεριον* is as soon written as *Timothy*), whether I say, they would not have run us down in one single view, and long since winded the Death of our excellent Bishops? We should have been taken for the most stubborn and stomachful Generation that ever handl'd Argument, and such wretched Disputants, as deserv'd to be beaten unto an acknowledgment of the Truth, rather than to be argu'd into it. How would they have taken it of us, if we had reply'd, that *St. Paul* meant not to commit the Care and Charge of the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete* unto the Elders, but to *Timothy* and *Titus* the chief of 'em, and to the rest of the Elders under and in subordination to them? But that the Commissions sent to *Timothy* and *Titus*, were intended for the Presbyteries, not once spoken of, is so wild and extravagant, in my conceit, that I am not able to produce any thing like it. And that I may discover the absurdity of this colourable pretext, and so dismiss the Controversie, I will lay before the Reader a Case that might possibly happen among our selves, and which will illustrate the unreasonableness of this Cavil of the Presbyterians. Let it then be suppos'd, that My Lord A. B. Y. wrote to My Lord B. C. "exhorting him--to suppress
 " Heretical Teachers; to take care of the due
 " Qualifications of those that are to be or-
 " dain'd; to encourage laborious Presbyters
 " as much as in him lay, with more honourable
 Main-

"Maintenance ; to condemn no Elders under
 "two or three Witnesses ; to rebuke the Guilty
 "Publicly ; to lay Hands suddenly on no Man ; to
 "Institute none but Faithful Men, who shall be
 "able to Teach ; to Watch and do the Work
 "of a Bishop, and to make full proof this
 "Ministry ; to set all things in order ; to ap-
 "point Ministers in every Church and Chap-
 "pel ; to rebuke sharply and with Authority,
 "and after the second Admonition to Silence,
 "Suspend and Reject Heretical Teachers.
 Shall we the ordinary Presbyters challenge
 to our selves the Care and Charge of these
 things, and pretend that my Lord of Y.
 wrote to my Lord of C. but as one of us or
 our Representative, meaning at the same time,
 that we all of us should be careful in the fore-
 said Matters ? Truly I think the Dissenters
 themselves would condemn us as great Fools
 for imagining any such thing.

Mutate nomina de — fabula narratur.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of Evangelists.

THIS Species of Church Officers, is spoken of but thrice in the Holy Scripture. The first time we meet with 'em is *Acts* 21. 8. *And we came unto Cesarea and we entred into the house of Philip the Evangelist, which was one of the Seven.*

The second is *Ephesians* 4. 11. *And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists.*

The last is that of *2 Tim.* 4. 5. — *Do the work of an Evangelist.* I have already shewn (chap. 1.) the difference between an Apostle and Prophet: Let us now examine what an Evangelist was. It appears from the Passage in the *Ephesians*, that Evangelists were in Dignity and Power next to Prophets, and above all other Church-Officers. It appears from that in *Timothy* that an Evangelist was one intrusted by the Apostles with the Government of some Church. That *Timothy* was an Evangelist, and that *Titus* therefore was another Evangelist. For it has been demonstrated already (chap. 2.) that all the supreme Powers of Ecclesiastical Government were committed to them two in their respective Churches.

I

And

And there is all the Reason in the World to think *Philp* also was such an one at *Casarea*: For *Philp* was an Inhabitant of *Jerusalem*, and there made a Deacon, *Acts* 6. But upon the Persecution he travell'd to *Samaria* preaching the Gospel, and thence to several other Cities and Countries, as *St. Luke* informs us *Acts* 8. who pursuing his Story, at length leaves him at *Casarea*, v. 40. We hear no more News of him till *Acts* 21. 8. where he still remains at *Casarea* almost 20 Years after, and is described thus,——*An Evangelist being one of the seven* that had been ordained Deacons. Now here at *Casarea*, *Philp* had an House and a settled Family, being able to entertain *Paul* and his Company. He was therefore resident at *Casarea*, and had his fixt abode there in all likelihood, and govern'd that Church. I cannot conceive any other Reason of his changing his Title from Deacon to Evangelist, and removing his Family from *Jerusalem* hither, and here abiding so long, except it were to govern and preside over the Church of *Casarea*, and in the Country Villages round about. I add this, because we may thereby give a fair Account of some Opinions which have prevail'd among learned Men, which yet cannot be so well done unless what I am now about to say be admitted.

Many have believed, that an Evangelist was an unsettled Church-Officer, going continually from place to place to finish the Churches

Churches begun by the Apostles, and particularly to ordain Elders among 'em. I cannot altogether allow this, because from *Acts* 8. 40. compar'd with *Acts* 21. 8. I have good reason to think, that *Philip* (as I have already noted) had been resident at *Cæsarea* 20. years, or thereabouts, and was still to continue there longer for any thing we read to the contrary. But I will readily grant that he went up and down the Country thereabouts, and as *Ravennellus* expresses it, ordain'd Elders *oppidatim* in every Town or Village. And I will grant that an Evangelist was not fixt to any one Congregation, but had the oversight of many: Nevertheless, I cannot allow that his Province was as large as that of the Apostles, but was limited to some City and to the Country adjacent. We do not therefore contend that *Timothy* and *Titus* (that I may here consider *J. O.*'s very loose way of arguing against us, pag. 18.) were Bishops in Title. It sufficeth us that they were Evangelists, and in Office the Supreme Governours of their respective Churches: If *St. Paul* had happen'd to have said——*Do the work of a Bishop, instead of an Evangelist* (as *J. O.* puts the case) I for my part should have thought our Argument so much the weaker, because in those Epistles, Elders and Bishops are the same, as I will suppose. But forasmuch as he said——*Of an Evangelist*, I will be bold to add that *Timothy* was something more than an ordinary Elder or Prebyterian-Bishop,

viz. an Evangelist, that had the Supreme Power of the *Ephesian* Church, and particularly of Ordaining Elders. But here *J. O.* pretends to prove, that *Timothy* the Evangelist could not be the first Governour

Euseb. l. 3. c. 37.
So it ought to
have been quoted
in *J. O.*

of *Ephesus*, because *Eusebius* thus describes Evangelists--“ They did preach Christ to those which had not as yet heard the Word of Faith; they deliver’d to them the Scriptures, ordain’d Pastors, committed to them the Charge of those that were newly received into the Church, and they did *ἐκείνους λαμβάνειν καὶ ἰδόντες*, pass over other Countries and Nations. Against this

I Offer another Testimony out of the same *Eusebius*, who writes *l. 2. c. 24.* That *Mark* the Evangelist being dead, *Anianus* enter’d upon the Administration of the Church of *Alexandria*. Hence I gather, that *Mark* the Evangelist had till his Death the Administration of the Church of *Alexandria*, and by consequent, that the Work of an Evangelist was the Government of some particular Church; and if so, *J. O.* must confess, that *Mark* was a resident Evangelist, not roving up and down the World, as *Eusebius* seems to speak of Evangelists in general. But I must not

Euseb. l. 3. c. 37. pass over this place of *Eusebius* so slightly. ’Twill be worth our while to give a more exact Account of that 37th. Chap. which is to the effect following—“ That about that time, viz. when

Ignatius

“ *Ignatius* dy’d, the Disciples of the Apostles
 “ being admirable divine persons, went up and
 “ down finishing the Work which the Apostles
 “ began; that having sold all their Possessions,
 “ they divided ‘em among the Poor; and
 “ then passing into foreign Countries, *ἱεροὶ*
 “ *ἐπιστολὴν ἐναγγελιστῶν*, did the work of Evange-
 “ lists to them who had not as yet heard of
 “ the Word of Faith. *And what was that?*
 “ Why, preaching Christ, delivering the Gos-
 “ pel, and ordaining ‘em other Pastors in
 “ their own steads, &c.

From whence I observe, 1. That the
 Work of Evangelists was to plant the Gospel
 among such as had not before heard the
 word of Faith; thus finishing the Work which
 the Apostles had begun, by gaining new and
 more Profelytes, and forming new and more
 Congregations in every Church, and ordinain-
 ing Elders for ‘em. For how else can any one
 reconcile these words, *Finishing the work which*
the Apostles began, with the following —
Did the work of Evangelists to them who had
not heard the word of Faith.

2. It does not hence appear to be the pro-
 per work of an Evangelist, to go up and down
 from one Country to another, preaching the
 Gospel. Many of the Disciples here spoken
 of did so. True! and many other Evangelists
 might have done so too by the order of the
 Apostles; but it was not an essential part of
 the Office of Evangelists. Their Work, ac-
 cording to *Eusebius* here was, 1. To preach

the Word of Faith. 2. To deliver the Gospel in writing to the new Converts. (We have 4. of 'em remaining to this day.) 3. To ordain 'em Pastors: But all this might be the Work of Resident Evangelists also; for such doubtless there were; and *Timothy* was, I conceive, both. At first, St. *Paul* employs him to many Churches, from whence after a while *Timothy* return'd back again to the Apostle, as is manifest in the *Acts*: He was at that time, as I may call him, an itinerant Evangelist. But when *Paul* was returning Westward to *Italy* and *Spain*, then (as I have shewn chap. 3.) he besought *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*, and fixt him the Evangelist there. Besides many of those Disciples and Evangelists, of whom *Eusebius* here writes, were fix'd Evangelists, and Governours of particular Churches; and the Historian plainly intimates as much at the latter end of that Chapter; specially when he promises to mention some few of the principal of 'em: Whereby it is manifest, that they were fix'd Evangelists, yea and Bishops too, even in Title. The Names of the Evangelists which he promis'd ch. 37. to give, were ch. 38. *Clemens*, *Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*; and chap. 39. *Papias*, and several others. Now all the world knows, that *Clemens* was Bishop of *Rome*, *Ignatius* of *Syria*, *Polycarp* of *Smyrna*; but here by *Eusebius* reckon'd among Evangelists also, and those fix'd too to their respective Seats. It is not

not then a necessary Note of an Evangelist, that he was a moving and unfix'd Minister.

But *J. O.* goes on and says, *That Chrysostom agrees with Eusebius*, that Holy Father having these words—Τέτιν ἐναρξάμενος, εἰ μὴ στείοντες πανταχῶ, ἀλλ' ἀγγελιζόμενοι, ὡς Πειραιᾶ καὶ Ἀνδρα.

In the first place, *J. O.* has committed here no greater a Mistake than his small one, to put the Affirmative for the Negative, and to leave out *πάντα*. It's not said by *St. Chrysostom* *μὴ*, but *εἰ μὴ στείοντες*, who went *not* up and down every where, as the Discretive *ἀλλ'* immediately following shews, as also the Adverb *πάντα* does, which *J. O.* to serve his cause quite left out. Nor was this the Printer's Fault, it being for *J. O.*'s purpose in that place, that *St. Chrysostom* should be represented, speaking what he never intended. For *J. O.* having immediately before observ'd, that *Eusebius* describes Evangelists as a sort of unfix'd Church-Officers, subjoins these words—*With whom* (*Eusebius*) *agrees* *Chrysostom*, *Τέτιν ἐναρξάμενος, εἰ μὴ στείοντες*, &c. which is just contrary to what the good Father asserted. This could not then be the Printer's Fault, but must be imputed to the Author himself. Furthermore, to cut off all pretence of excuse, and that *J. O.* may have nothing to offer, which may in any degree palliate his Insincerity, I note,

1. That *St. Chrysostom*, just after the foregoing words, describes *Timothy* and *Titus* thus—εἰ καθήμενος καὶ οὐκ ἔνα τόπον ἡγομένης, who abode

and were employ'd in one place, that is, were resident Evangelists. Surely, if *J. O.* read thus far (as I doubt not, I am sure he ought) he could not but see, that the $\mu\alpha$ must be $\mu\alpha$; That is, that *Chrysostom's* Proposition was Negative, and not as *J. O.* made it, Affirmative.

2. *Theophylact* the Transcriber of *St. Chrysostom*, reads the place so—— $\epsilon\iota \mu\alpha \alpha\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$.

3. All the Editions of *Chrysostom*, that I can hear of, both Greek and Latin, in both Universities, as I am inform'd from some learn'd Gentlemen there, run in the Negative. As the Latin printed at *Bazil* by *Froben* and *Hervagius*. Commentar. on *Paul's* Epistles, 2 Vol. printed at *Verona*, 1509. *Commelin's* Edition, 1596. and 1603. *Morellius's* Edition of *Chrysostom's* Commentary upon the New Testament printed at *Paris*, 1633. *Sir Hen. Savil* at *Eaton*, *Fronto Ducaus* at *Paris*. It cannot therefore enter into my thoughts, that any thing could lead *J. O.* into this Errour, but Design and want of Sincerity. Saint *Chrysostom* then must be acknowledg'd on my Side, and to have affirm'd the Evangelists were fix'd, and Resident Church-Rulers, and that *Timothy* and *Titus* were so.

It seems then upon the whole matter most probable to me, that there were two sorts of Evangelists; one that travelled up and down from place to place, by the Apostle's Commands, to order, establish, perfect, and encrease Churches begun by 'em: Another sort, that were fixt and resident.

And

And even these latter were not so fixt, but they might move and remove for the service of the Gospel, and upon the Apostles instance, especially to places within some little compass about 'em, as I noted before. For I imagin the Apostles chiefly planted Churches in greater Towns and Cities, and left the adjacent Villages unto these Evangelists to be converted, and form'd by degrees into Congregations, which well sutes with that of *Eusebius*, who testifies that the Evangelists *preach'd Christ to those which had not as yet heard the Word of Faith*. And to that other saying also, that *They finish'd the Work which the Apostles began*, viz. by adding thereunto the Neighbouring Towns and Villages.

Two things I gather from the whole;

1. That the Elders could not have the Supreme Power lodg'd in 'em, that especially of ordaining Elders. For then the Office and Work of an Evangelist had been needless.

2. That the supreme Governors of Churches, call'd Evangelists, were succeeded by others styl'd only Bishops. I have noted before that Mark the Evangelist was supreme Governor of *Alexandria*, *Euseb. l. 2. ch. 24*. But *Anianus* his Successor is stil'd Bishop, *Eusebius l. 3. c. 14*.

CHAP. V.

*Being an Answer to J. O. his Plea for
Scripture Ordination.*

I Am now to make a particular Reply to such things as this Authour has advanc'd against Bishops, in behalf of Presbyteri-an Ordination. It is not intended as an Answer unto his whole Book, but to so much of it, as falls within the Compass of my Discourse, viz. within the Apostolical Age. Nor will I take notice of his peevish and impertinent Reflections, which are nothing to the Argument before us, and contrary to what his Voucher Mr. Williams promises us of him, viz. that J. O. *design'd not to reflect on Episcopal Ordination, nor to raise any unseasonable Debates among Protestants.* But 'tis manifest that J. O. intended no such thing, and 'tis to be suspected, Mr. Williams knew as much, or that J. O. departed from his first Resolutions, and deceiv'd both himself and his Friend Mr. W. and abus'd his Reader also. Be this as it will, I shall endeavour to give a just Reply to his Arguments, and that's all I am concern'd for.

J. O. in his Preface observes, that Bishops were constituted for a Remedy against Schism, for which he produces the Testimony of St. *Jerom.* He might and ought in Justice to have

have taken notice that this happen'd before *Ignatius* was Bishop of *Syria*. But that would have brought his Reader too near the Fountain-head, the Holy Scripture, and the Apostolical Times, which was neither to his Advantage nor to his Purpose. Nevertheless, that one Person was for the reason aforesaid constituted over a Church, as Superiour Ruler thereof, (whether under the Title of Bishop, is not the Question) even in the Apostolical Days, and consequently by the Apostles themselves, is plainly enough intimated by *Jerom* himself, who testify's it was done *postquam*, after, that is, as soon as Men began to say; one, I am of Paul, another, I am of Apolos. Now this happen'd in the Church of *Corinth*, (according to Bishop *Pearson's* Chronology) before *Paul* Constituted *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops; it may be about 10 Years. For we must not think the Schisms among the *Corinthians* alone did prevail with the Apostles presently to appoint Superiour Governours over all the Churches: But that when the Gangren spread, and the humour of Separating themselves, began to possess the greatest part of the Christian Churches; (whereof the *Corinthians* were the Ringleaders), it was then high time for the Apostles to provide a Remedy, and to Introduce this Order of Government everywhere, as *Ignatius* says. In short, we must not believe, as *J. O.* would have us, that the Disease of Schism arose in after-times, or that the Remedy of Bishops was

was not apply'd for a Cure till after an Age or two, but that all this hapen'd in the Apostles days, and by Consequence, that the Institution of Bishops was Apostolical. Now that the like Disease of Schism soon appear'd in other Churches, as well as in the *Corinthian*, is partly manifest from St. Pauls Epistles, and especially from Act. 20. 30.—*Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away Disciples after them*: The Apostle foreseeing that the same Divisions would happen at *Ephesus*, among their Elders, as had already happen'd at *Corinth*.

How well Episcopal Government has Answer'd its first Design, I'll not inquire here. The wisest and best Institutions in the World, have in length of time degenerated, and through the Wiles of the Devil, the Corruptions of humane Nature, and the stubborn and unruly Dispositions of naughty and disobedient Men, have been disappointed. But, it might be worth the while to consider whether among us in *England*, the Presbyterian Government has had any better success, or half so good. From the Year 40. to 60. all the World knows what variety of Sects and Hereticks sprung up in the Church; so that the Presbyterian Government which began to be set up in many parts of *England*, in a few years came to nothing, and their mortal Enemies, the Independents, got the Ascendant over 'em, or ere they could half finish that new project of theirs. I have by me a
M. S.

M. S. of the Transactions of the 2d. Class of the Province of *Lancaster* at their Monthly Meeting, wherein I observe, they were not able, nor did endeavour, (that I find) to do anything wisely or worthy of those glorious Pretences, unto the Reformation of Church Government, which the World expected of them. The *Arminians*, *Antinomians* and the *Independents*, and other sorts of Erroneous Preachers made head against 'em and baffl'd all their Designs; inſomuch as about the Year 57 it dwindl'd to nothing, nor had they any more Monthly Meeting, that I find or could ever hear of.

And now, that they have had it in their Power theſe 7 Years laſt paſt, to eſtabliſh and exerciſe the Presbyterian Government; they have not, they dare not for their Ears attempt it. They know their old Friends the Independents would never endure it. And in a word, thoſe two Parties are beholden to the Biſhops for their preſent Agreement, ſuch as it is. Were the Biſhops once down, (which God forbid) 'tis certain the Presbyterians could never get into the Saddle. All the particular Congregations would be Independent, like thoſe of the Factious *Corinthians*.

It's 7. O's great, it may be wilful, miſtake, when ſpeaking of Pariſh Priests, that is, the Presbyters of the Church of *England*, he affirms, that they have no Power of Discipline in the Church: Whereas all the Canons or Laws of the Church, are made by the Priests
of

of the Church of *England*, as well as by the Bishops. True, the Bishops are the chief Executors of 'em; but not the sole neither.

There is room left for Priests to exercise some parts of Church Discipline. As

1. To rebuke and reprove Sinners.

2. To suspend 'em for a while from the Lords Supper. They cannot indeed Excommunicate. But when *7. O.* proves out of Scripture, that ever any ordinary Presbyters did Excommunicate; then will I undertake that this Power shall be restor'd to us ordinary Presbyters.

But at the same time I would fain see what Power these Presbyter-Bishops or Ministers themselves at this day have over *their* Flocks. There is usually one, and perhaps sometimes two belonging to the Congregation: Whereas the Lay-Elders of the same Congregation are about half a dozen, who will therefore easily by their number over-rule the Preaching Elder in the deliberative and judicial part of the Government, whilst the little Bishop is at best but the Executioner of *their* Will. Men should always have a care of objecting against their Adversaries what may with better Reason be retorted upon themselves; *Cum tu multisia sumis, Cretice, pelluces.*

I have already suppos'd that
3. O. p. 12, 13. in the New Testament Presbyter and Bishop are all one, or at least that those Titles are promiscuously apply'd unto several Species of Church-Officers, as are most others
alio

also. I further do allow that *ἐπίσκοπος* *ἐκκλησιαστικός* may signify ordinary ruling, but not Lay-Elders, yet this will not prove there were not in the Churches Rulers superiour to them, who also might be call'd *ἐπίσκοπος* *ἐκκλησιαστικός* and *ἐκκλησιαστικός*, as *Timothy* and *Titus* were over the ordinary Elders of *Ephesus* and *Crete*. Will any one affirm (perhaps a 100 or 200 years hence, some Critick like *J. O.* will dare to assert) that the Churches of *England* had no superiour Rulers or Bishops, because the Parish Ministers are call'd *Rectors*. There may be several ranks of Rulers one above another: Every Captain of a company of Soldiers is *ἐπίσκοπος* *ἐκκλησιαστικός* and *ἐκκλησιαστικός*, the Ruler of that Company. When *Moses* *Deut. 1. 15.* Made *Captains over Thousands, Captains over Hundreds, Captains over Fifties, and Captains over Tens*; I suppose the Captains of Ten were subject to the Captains of Fity; these, to those of an Hundred; and all, to the Captain of Thousands. In like manner, tho' the *Ephesian* Elders be call'd *ἐπίσκοπος*, Rulers, this hinders not but there might be a Ruler over 'em, even as I who am the unworthy Rector of *B.* have a Ruler over me, my Right Reverend Diocesan.

Nor can any Advantage be got by the word *ποιμαίνειν*, feeding the Flock of Christ. For if it signifies to Rule, as *J. O.* says, then we have given an Answer already: But furthermore, in that second of *Rev. 27.* *ποιμαίνει* is spoken of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nevertheless
I imagine

I imagine *J. O.* will grant at least that the Elders are also *pastors*, Pastors. If so then there may be Shepherds under Shepherds, and so in several Ranks and Degrees. *E. g.* When the Sons of *Jacob* told *Pharaoh*, *Gen.* 47. 3. ——— *Thy servants are Shepherds, both we and also our Fathers*, I do suppose *J. O.* will acknowledge that *Jacob* was the Supreme Shepherd, his Sons the second Rank of Shepherds, and that there were a third sort, meer Servants.

To conclude, whatever Names or Titles be given unto Presbyters in Scripture, it proves not that they had any inherent Power to ordain. I expect to see it prov'd: Till then *J. O.*'s *Minor* is thus far lame, *viz.* That the Presbyters had inherent Power to ordain, which he has as yet in vain endeavour'd to prove.

Page 14. That there were several Bishops in Churches in the Apostles days, and that those mention'd in Scripture were not of our *English* species, is suppos'd. (For I will not multiply Controversies.) But there was an Order of Church-Officers above these Presbyter-Bishops, as we have demonstrated, in the Churches of *Crete* and *Ephesus*.

Let us suppose at present with *J. O.* that to Minister in the Word and Sacraments is more honorable than to rule and govern; it will not follow, that a Presbyter who dispences the Word and Sacraments, is more honourable than the Bishop who rules and governs also. For, as if a Master who has divers Journey-men

men under him, appoints a Fore-man over the rest, this Fore-man is so much the Better Man, because he not only works as the other Journey-men do, but also oversees them and appoints them their Task; so the Bishop also who ministers in the Word and Sacraments, and has the ruling Power likewise, is more honourable than an ordinary Presbyter, who only dispenses the Word and Sacraments.

Nor does St. Paul say expressly, *That they who labour in the Word and Doctrine deserve more honour than they that rule well.* It is not so much as implied in that place, *1 Tim. 5. 17.* to which J. O. refers. He only intimates, that they who rule well deserve double Honour, and more than they who rule not so well; and that they who rule well, and also labour in the Word and Doctrine, deserve better than they only who rule well, but don't withall labour in the Word and Doctrine.

I cannot see what advantage J. O. P. 15, 16. can promise himself from that Observation, that -- *Peter styles himself Presbyter, never Bishop.* 'Tis not unusual for humble and modest persons to content themselves with lower Titles, than what belongs to them. But what does J. O. think? that Presbyter is hereby become a more honourable Title than Bishop? That cannot be, both because J. O. supposes 'em Titles of the same Persons and Office, as also because the Apostleship is call'd *ἐπισκοπή*, Bishoprick

K

Bishoprick, *Acts*. 1 20. Therefore an Apostle was a Bishop as well as a Presbyter, tho something more than both. And although the Elders received a Commission from St. Paul and Peter *ἐπισκοπεῖν*, will it thence follow that there was none to overrule them; or does it hence appear, that these Elders had Power to ordain? Verily if this be so, every Believer has the same Power. For St. Paul bids them *ἐπισκοπεῖν*, to play the Bishops, or as 'tis in our Translation——*To look diligently, lest any man fail of the Grace of God, Heb. 12. 15.* Briefly, it makes nothing to the purpose what Titles the Apostles assum'd or contented themselves with; still we know, they did and had Power to govern the Churches, and to ordain. Nor is it material by what honorable Names they called the ordinary Elders; still we know that they had not the supreme Authority over the Churches after the time we have assign'd, nor did they ever ordain Elders.

J. O. wonders that *Bishops*
 Page 16, 17. *are not reckon'd up among Church*
Officers, Ephes. 4. 11. The
 Reason is obvious. Bishops as a distinct Species of Church Officers, were not as yet Establish'd according to my Hypothesis. The itinerant or unfixed Evangelists (being the Apostles Disciples according to *Eusebius*) govern'd the Churches under the Apostles; and ordain'd Elders for 'em. And thus it continued until the Apostles setled fixt Governours of the Churches out of their Disciples, who
 were

were also call'd Evangelists; and were succeeded by other Governours, who assum'd only the inferiour Title of Bishop, as has been shewn. There was therefore no occasion for the Apostle to reckon up any distinct Officers of the Church, by the name of Bishop.

"Our *English* Episcopacy (say's) P. 17. 18.
 "J. O. has scarce one Argument for
 "its defence, but what will indifferently serve
 "the Popish Prelacy. The Bishops best Weapons
 "have been dexterously manag'd against the
 "whole Reformation. If I should say half as
 "much of the Presbyterians, or should but transcribe a Tyth of what the Independents have said of'em, it would not I believe be taken well at my Hands. I'll content my self with observing; that J. O. in this very Book has made use of the Popish School-men, of *Peter Lumbert*, (p. 55.) of *Bonaventure*, *Durandus*, *Dominicus*, *Soto*, *Aureolus*, *Thomas Aquinas*, of the Canonists, *Gratian*, *Semeca* and some of the Popish Councils. (p. 107.) Nevertheless, that I may Justifie him and our selves too, as to this way of Controverting, (tho' when I justifie him, I cannot avoid taxing him at the same time with great Insincerity and Partiality) that which I would say is, that Truth is Truth and to be imbrac'd, tho' it come out of the Mouth of an Adversary. And J. O. must not think to shuffle us off with this popular way of declaiming against our Arguments, because forsooth they are made use of by Papiſts. It may work a lie-

tle upon the Ignorant Mobb for a while, but the Arguments are never the worse for that; *fas est & ab hoste doceri.* 'Tis in my Judgment very hard upon us, that we must not defend our selves with such reasons as the cause will bear, and furnishes us with, because forsooth the Papists have urg'd the same; but must be forc'd to seek out new ones for no other reason, except because the Papists have defil'd 'em. At this rate J. O. must not permit the King to use Gun-powder against his Enemies, because a Popish Monk invented it; nor to Bombard Towns, because the *French King* did so first. We employ against the *Socinians* and *Arians* the same Arguments that the Papists do, and so would J. O. I believe, and yet reckon them every whit as good as if himself had first found 'em out. One thing I will be bold to tell J. O. that he will here meet with an Argument borrow'd from Bishop *Pearson*, which I think neither any Papist nor J. O. himself ever thought of before. I desire then, that this at least may pass muster with him, since it is a Weapon of our own Invention and Improvement. But what tho' my Sword and my Spear were made at the Forges of the Uncircumcis'd *Philistines*? This shall not hinder me sharpening them with my own File; and employing 'em against my Enemy, when he assaults me.

p. 15. 20. It's the Opinion of J. O. that from those words, *Lay Hands suddenly on no Man*, It cannot be concluded, that the Sole Power of Ordination belong'd to *Timothy*. Now I think it ought thence to be

be so concluded till *J. O.* can produce a like Commission given to the Presbyters. But *J. O.*'s Reason is a very pleasant one. *It may* (he adds) *as well follow, that the sole Power of Teaching and Exhorting d d belong to him, because the Apostle bids him be instant in Season and out of Season, in Preaching the Word.* By no means; because *St. Paul* at the same time that he admonishes *Timothy* to Preach diligently, he directs him expressly to appoint other Teachers, *2 Tim. 2. 2.* Which also is most evidently suppos'd in sundry other Passages, in that first Epistle of *Timothy*. We desire to see some like Passages of other Ordainers beside *Timothy*.

Well but, now *J. O.* offers at p. 10. something to his purpose, if it were as well prov'd, as 'tis confidently asserted. "He affirms that *Timothy* could not receive the sole Power of Ordination, because *Paul* himself did not assume the Power of Ordination into his own Hands, but took in the Presbyters also. His first proof of this drawn from *1 Tim. 4. 14.* has been fully discut already. His second Proof is from *Act. 14. 23.* where *Barnabas* join'd with him in the Ordinations, there mention'd to be made. But the mischief is, *Barnabas* was *Paul's* Equal; no ordinary Presbyter, but an Apostle as well as himself, *Act. 14. 4, 14.* And 'tis but *J. O.*'s Dream, when he talks of other ordinary Presbyters, ordaining with these two Apostles.

I desire to see this made out, by any tolerable Conjecture.

J. O. p. 20.

Paul's intention to go to *Ephesus*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. ch. 4. 13. hinders not *Timothy* from being the resident Bishop there, as J. O. would have it. Might not *Timothy* reside at *Ephesus*, tho the Apostle sometimes visited the 'Church? Or must *Timothy* immediately be gone, when the Apostle came thither?

But J. O. in urging the Argument, is not to be excus'd, for saying the Apostle besought *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus*, till he came. The Apostle besought him to abide there, true; but he does not add, till I come: These latter words are to be found, Chapter 4. 13. and are thence borrow'd by our Author; and foisted into that Passage, ch. 1. 3. Nor is it to the purpose; that the Apostle orders *Timothy* thus; — ch. 4. 13. Till I come give attendance to reading. For as the *Israelites* are said *Act.* 7. 17, 18. to have grown and multiply'd till another King arose; and yet grew and multiply'd afterwards also: For tho' *Pharaoh* design'd the contrary, yet *Exodus* 1. 12. The more *Pharaoh* afflicted them, the more they multiply'd and grew. So, it cannot be imagin'd, that *Timothy* must have given over reading; as soon as *Paul* should have arriv'd at *Ephesus*. Nor does this Passage imply that *Paul* would then remove him to some other Church. I cannot for my heart find any Colour for either of these Glosses

J. O.

¶ O. Further argues, that *Paul* sent *Timothy* to *Corinth*, *Philippi* Page 20. and *Thessalonica*, &c. furnish'd without doubt with the same Powers. This is a meer Postulatum, and begging the question. That *Paul* sent *Timothy* to those Churches, cannot be question'd: but this was long before he constituted him Bishop of *Ephesus*: That at the same time he furnish'd *Timothy* with the same Power, as afterwards at *Ephesus*, is not out of doubt. I require it to be proved. Lastly, let it be suppos'd that all this is true, yet the Apostle never sent him to abide in any of those Churches. He was then at most but an unsettled Evangelist to minister among them for a while, as in the *Acts*, and *Paul's* Epistles appears. Whereas, then *Paul* besought him to abide, and reside at *Ephesus*, and we never find him in the Apostles company again, nor in any other place after; we must take him for the resident Evangelist or Bishop here, until ¶ O. shall please to tell us, either out of the Sacred or Ecclesiastical History, whither he removed.

" This place, *Against an Elder receive not*
 " *an Accusation*, proves not *Timothy's* power
 " over Presbyters, says ¶ O. To receive an
 " Accusation is to acquaint the
 " Church with the Crime, as he Page 21.
 " adds upon *Dr. Whitaker's* Autho-
 " rity; and this not only Superiors, but E-
 " quals may do, yea and Inferiors too.

Answer, 1. I cannot understand that to re-

ceive an Accusation is the same thing as to acquaint the Church with it. 'Tis possible that to receive an Accusation may be in order to acquaint the Church with it, but 'tis not the same thing as to acquaint the Church with it. They are certainly too different Actions.

2. If a Superior (as *J. O.* grants) may receive an Accusation; then for ought he knows, or can hence prove to the contrary, *Timothy* was Superior in the Church of *Ephesus*.

3. I grant that Equals also may receive an Accusation alledg'd against Equals, and bring it before the Church; and so may Inferiors against Superiors; but this cannot be the meaning of *Paul* in this place.

1. Because *Timothy* had power also to rebuke the Offender before all, authoritatively and publickly in the Face of the Church.

2. Because if *Timothy* was only to acquaint the Church with it, he was no better than an Informer or Prosecutor, which any Man has a Right, a natural Right to be, if he please. 'Twas then a very mean Office indeed, which the Apostle here committed to him, and which

3. Would be absurd to think should be prest upon *Timothy* (as to the faithful discharge of it) in such solemn lofty and tremendous Words, as follow --- *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels, that thou observe these things without partiality,*
1 Ep. 5. 21. If our Bishops should thus address to our Apparitors (for such one *J. O.* with the help

help of Dr. *Whitaker* has made *Timothy*) I am persuaded all Men would be scandaliz'd at it.

4. The Limitations added——*but under two or three Witnesses*, will not admit the fore-said sense put upon the place by *J. O.* as if *Timothy* were a Promooter. For doubtless one may receive an Accusation, in order to have the Church acquainted with it, and that it may be examin'd, under *one* Witness only, or upon a bare Suspicion without any direct or positive Proof. The meaning then must be, receive not an Accusation, so as to proceed unto Sentence against an Offender, except the Crime be prov'd upon him by two Witnesses at least: then condemn and rebuke him openly. But Dr. *Whitaker* went farther than our Author thought fit to follow him, and will needs prove, that an Equal may rebuke before all. Under favour of that great Man, I utterly deny it. I have not that learned Professor's Works by me, and am therefore forc'd to represent his Argument, as I find it laid in Mr. *Tim. unbishop*, *Prynne*, where the Doctor pre-
tends to prove his Paradox by this Observation out of Antiquity, that (says he) *an offending Bishop was to be judg'd by a Synod of Bishops. Risum teneatis.* Surely the Professor was never more out of his Chair, than when he disputed after this manner. Did ever any Man affirm or believe that one Bishop was equal to a Synod of Bishops? Surely, Mr. *Prynne* of all Men might have known better

better things. I am perswaded he knew that a single Member of the House of Commons is to be judged by the House, and yet is not equal to the whole House. One Bishop is indeed equal to another, and one Commoner to another; but neither of 'em has Power to check his equal openly, and in a judiciary way, although they may reprove him privately in a fraternal and charitable way.

Page 22.

“ J. O. goes on and observes,
 “ that *Paul* promis'd to come
 “ shortly to *Ephesus*: What had *Paul* to do at
 “ *Ephesus* now, if he had a Successor there? or
 “ had no Power over him or his Church?
 “ Would he be ~~deity~~ and ~~intervention~~
 “ intermeddling in another man's Office, which
 “ he forbids in others?

But what a trifling objection is this against *Timothy's* Episcopal Power at *Ephesus*? Who ever affirmed, or thought *Timothy* so absolute, as not to be subject to St. *Paul*? And what will become of the Elders Authority, if J. O's Reasoning here be good? If they had still the oversight of the Church of *Ephesus*, may it not in like manner be ask'd, what had *Paul* to do to interlope in their Province, which he had long before (*Act.* 20.) committed to 'em? But, if this objection is of no force against the suppos'd Authority of the *Ephesian Presbyter-Bishops*, 'tis none against the Authority of *Timothy* the *Evangelist-Bishop*. Besides, *Paul's* promise to go to *Ephesus* may be imagin'd consistent with *Timothy's* supreme and independent Power

Power there; it may (I say) be imagin'd, if one would or needed to advance such a Paradox. May not I promise to go to see my Neighbour Presbyter, but it must be surmis'd, that I pretend Power over him and his Flock? Or may not J. O. resolve to visit Mr. *Williams*, without suspicion of claiming any jurisdiction over Mr. W. or his Congregation? But such stuff as this does our Author impose upon his Friends, and needlessly troubles his Adversaries with. 'Twere insufferable impertinence to make any Reply unto these things, were it not, that his Party wou'd cry out, that J. O's Book is unanswerable; and therefore I hope the gentle Reader will excuse me herein.

" J. O. moves the Question, of what extent the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete* were, in the Apostles days, and the times next immediately following? Of what number they consisted, and how many Congregations? He is of opinion, they consisted not of an hundred, or two hundred Parishes or Congregations, as our Dioceses at this day do. Answer, I am of J. O's mind too. But I farther Reply, that they consisted of many Congregations: And I'll content my self to prove it by the Presbyterians own Arguments, because I will not offend him, by borrowing any of the Papists; I mean those of the *London* Ministers, long since urg'd against the Independents, in their Treatise call'd — *Deus divinum Ministerii Anglicani*, and Printed 1647 Pag. 224. " The Church of *Ephesus* (say those
Gen-

See also the form
of Ch. Govern-
ment, drawn up
by the Assembly
of Divines, to the
same effect.

“ Gentlemen) had in it more
“ Congregations than one. For,
“ 1. the number of Prophets
“ and Preachers at *Ephesus* were
“ many. *Paul* continu’d there
“ two years and three months,
“ *Act.* 19. 8, 10. And *Paul* settled there about
“ twelve Disciples, who Prophecy’d, *ch.* 19. 1,
“ 6, 7. And how should these thirteen Ministers
“ be employ’d, if there were not many Con-
“ gregations? Compare also *Act.* 20. 17, 18,
“ 36, 37. where ’tis said of the Bishops of *E-*
“ *phesus*; that *Paul* kneeled down and prayed
“ with ’em all, and they all wept sore. Here
“ is a good number imply’d. 2. The gift of
“ Tongues also was given unto all these twelve
“ Prophets, *Act.* 19. 6, 7. To what end, if they
“ had not several Congregations, and several
“ Languages, to speak in these several Tongues
“ unto ’em? 3. The multitude of believers must
“ needs be great at *Ephesus*. For, 1. Why should
“ *Paul*, who had universal Commission to plant
“ Churches in all the World, stay about two
“ years at *Ephesus*, if no more had been con-
“ verted there, than to make up one single
“ Congregation? *Act.* 19. 8, 10. 2. During
“ this space, all that dwelt in *Asia* (usually
“ meeting at *Ephesus* for worship,) heard the
“ Word of the Lord, both *Jews* and *Greeks*, *Act.*
“ 19. 10. 3. At the knowledg of *Paul*’s Mi-
“ racles, Fear fell upon all the *Jews* and *Greeks*
“ dwelling at *Ephesus*; and the name of the
“ Lord *Jesus* was magnify’d, *Act.* 19. 17. 4.
Many

“ Many of the Believers came and confessed,
 “ and shewed their deeds, v. 18. whereby is in-
 “ timated, that more did believe than did thus.
 “ 5. Many also of them that used curious Arts,
 “ brought their Books together, and burned
 “ them before all Men, and they counted the
 “ price of them, and found it Fifty Thousand
 “ pieces of Silver ; (This they wou’d never have
 “ done publickly, if the major part, or at
 “ least a very great and considerable part of
 “ the City, had not embrac’d the Faith, that
 “ City being so furiously zealous in their Super-
 “ stition and Idolatry,) *so mightily grew the*
 “ *word of God, and prevail’d, Act. 19. 19, 20.*
 “ 6. Paul testifies, that at *Ephesus*, a great
 “ Door and effectual, was open’d unto him, viz.
 “ a most advantagious opportunity of bring-
 “ ing in a mighty Harvest of Souls to Christ, 1
 “ *Cor. 16. 8, 9.* Put all together, how is it
 “ possible to imagine, upon any solid ground,
 “ that there were no more, but one single Con-
 “ gregation in the Church of *Ephesus*? These
 are the *London Presbyterian Arguments*, which
 7. O. may confute, if he thinks fit.

As for the Church of *Crete*, ’tis expressly or-
 der’d by St. Paul, that *Titus* was to constitute
 Elders in every City. Now altho’ at
 that time, ’tis likely, there was not *Tit. 1. 5.*
 in every City, or Town, a Congregation of
 Christians; yet his Commission was to provide
 Elders, for every City, that is, for as many as
 occasion afterward shou’d require; and they
 might be very many, tho’ not an hundred, in
 a lit-

a little time. Dr. *Maurice* indeed seems to be of Opinion, that the Poets Epithire ~~is~~ *is* the Island of an hundred Cities, was more for the Verse than truth's sake; and yet with submission to better Judgments, I do conceive the number of Cities, or great Towns in that Island of *Crete* was extraordinary, when I recollect the Character of it, given by the Epitomator of *Livy*, and the Motive that induc'd the Ro-

mans to reduce it under their
Florus l. 3. c. 5. Power—*Creticum bellum nos fecimus solâ vincendi nobilem Insulam Cupiditate.*

Dr. Heylin reckons in it 1044 Towns and Villages, 207 Parishes. At one time four Archbishops, and 21 Bishops. At another 1 A. B. and 8 Bishops.

And now my hand's in, I will add here another Testimony, that Bishops had many congregations under their Care, 'tis that of Euseb. l. 2. c. 16. where he writes,

that Mark is said to have gone into Egypt, and to have Establish'd *ἐκκλησιας* Churches in Alexandria; and that there was moreover, in that Place, a very great Multitude that embrac'd the Faith.

It was a noble Isle, it seems, long before the Apostles days, that is, as I understand the Historian, abounded in wealth and number of People, and consequently, in Towns and great Cities: Nor do I see any reason it should decay, under the *Romans* afterwards. If then *Titus* at first had not many Cities under his Care, yet *Paul* foresaw he might have in a little time, and therefore appointed him to ordain, and constitute Elders in every City. So that, he was in design at least, Bishop of many Congregations.

As

As for *Ignatius's one Altar*, J. O. p. 29, 30. it signifies not one numerical, but one specifical Altar; that is, tho many in number, and in several places, yet all as one united to the Bishop, and in Communion with him, or set up with his Consent, and by his Approbation. This Sense is countenanc'd by the very place quoted by J. O. tho he wisely left out what I am about to note. After the words alledged by J. O. *Ignatius* goes on thus — *ἡνὶν ἁγία ἐνχαριστία ὅπου ἂν εἴη τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, ἢ ὅ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτελέῃ.* *Let that Eucharist be accounted good and firm which is celebrated under the Bishop; that is, either in his Presence, or by his Appointment, and under his Authority; or thus, by the Bishop himself; then he adds, or where or to whom he gives order to celebrate it.* So that the Lord's Supper was to be accounted good and firm, if he that ministred did it with the Bishop's Consent and Allowance, and not otherwise.

In a word, this part of that Sentence — *ὅ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτελέῃ*, implies more than one Congregation or numerical Altar; it imports, only that the Bishop's Consent is requisite. After the same manner is this other Period to be expounded — *Wherever the Bishop appears, there let the People be, even as where Jesus Christ (appears) there is the Catholick Church.* It cannot be meant, where Jesus Christ in Person is, but where he is in his spiritual Power, Vertue, and Authority: And so as to the Bishop,

shop, Wherever he appears, though not in Person, yet in his Authority, there let the People be, and there is the Church of *Smyrna*. But where the Bishop is not in his Power and Consent (if any Altar be set up against, and in opposition to him and to his Altar) there is not the Church of *Smyrna*, neither is that Eucharist good and firm. All this may be farther manifested by what follows — *It is not lawful* *χωρίς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου* *to baptize or communicate without the Bishop*; but *ἡ δὲ αὐτοῦ δοξασι*, *what he the Bishop shall approve, that's well-pleasing unto God*. So that the Bishop must consent and approve it, else it is not lawful, nor well-pleasing unto God.

The like may be argu'd, from that Passage in *Ignatius's Epistle to the Ephesians*—*οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν σωτηρία τῇ γράμει τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*. Tho' they were not always to be at the Bishops heels, nor in his presence, yet they were ever to follow his Counsel and Directions. And to the *Trallians* he thus speaks — *There is but one Eucharist, one Flesh of our Lord, and one Cup to the Union of his Blood, one Altar, as also one Bishop*. Let it be suppos'd, that there were but two Congregations here (that's modest enough I hope) yet still there was but one Eucharist and one Altar; one in Union and Communion with the Bishop, and in subjection to him, as has already been explain'd. And if two in such a mystical Sense may be one; as doubtless they may, *1 Cor. 10, 16, 17*. two hundred may be one.

In

In fine, supposing but one Congregation in these Churches, and many Presbyters, I cannot however find the Presbyterian Parity there. The Bishops 'tis plain, in *Ignatius*, were superiour. He's blind, or wilfully winks that sees not this, and refuses to acknowledg it. And if but one Congregation; why a Bishop and so many Presbyters, who deserv'd to be call'd a Presbytery? Besides Deacons, as is insinuated in all *Ignatius's* Epistles. One would think that the Bishop, and one Presbyter, and one Deacon might have suffic'd, especially when the Bishop himself was able (as *J. O.* pleads afterwards) to deal with every single Person. I add, that it seems to me very probable, *Act. 19. 10.* that the Church of *Ephesus* took in all *Asia* (the proper)---all they which dwelt in *Asia* heard the word of the Lord *Jesus*, viz. at *Ephesus*, whether they repair'd to *St. Paul*, for that purpose. And the same may with reason be thought of the Church of *Antioch*, that it comprehended a good part of *Syria*. *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the *Romans*, stiling himself the Bishop (not of *Antioch*, but) of *Syria*.

It is not my Province, to pursue *J. O.* thro the Ages following. In stead thereof, I'll send the Reader, to the very learned Dr. *Mau- rice*, in whom he'll meet with a full and satisfactory Reply, both to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Clarkson* too. In the mean while, it was but a careless part of *J. O.* to take no notice of the Drs. Answer; as if his own two mighty

L

Cham-

Champions, still kept the Field invincible. It had been a nobler Enterprize, and more for his Honour to have enter'd the Lists, with Dr. *Mauvrice*, tho' he had been foild in the Rancounter, than to trouble us with a new Book upon an old Subject, without adding any thing considerable to it.

I have unawares slipt over what *J. O.* † notes about *Ignatius* Passage * *συνερχομεναι ος ενχαριστας και ος δεσας* *διν' οτ' αν γδ πικρως εινι το αυτην πλανη &c.* Give diligence to assemble together more frequently. For when ye assemble often together, the Powers of Satan are destroy'd. *J. O.* Translates *εινι το αυτην* in one, or to the same place; and justifies himself by our Translation of *Act. 2. 1.* where *εινι το αυτην* is so render'd. But in the first place, I am pretty sure, that *εινι το αυτην* does not properly and strictly signifie in one place. 'Tis not so render'd *Act. 2. 44.* nor could be, *St. Luke* there adding——and had all things common. Now that the Historian meant not to say, they were altogether in one Place, is manifest, 1. because the number of believers were then 3500 * which it's incredible should meet together in one Place, as their Circumstances then were. 2. Because *St. Luke* having an occasion to repeat the very same Observation, expresseth himself after another manner, whereby the former Passage is to be explain'd. 'Tis in *Act. 4. 32.*——*ην ησαν ομοθυμω*

† Page 29.

* Page 25. Vol.

* *Act. 2. 41.*

1 *Cor. 15. 6.*

ἦ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν ἡ ψυχὴ μία, καὶ ἅρ' αὐτῶν τὰς ἀπαντα κοινὰ.
The Believers, were of one Heart and of one Soul,
and had all things common. So then εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ

Αἰ. 44. and ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία ch. 4. 32.

signifie one and the same thing, and the latter determines the true sense of the former. From

whence it appears, that εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ does not properly signifie *one Place*: It often signifies

Unity and Concord in general, as Ps. 133. 1.

Behold how good and how pleasant it is, for Brethren to dwell together in Unity. Tis in the LXX.

εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ. I farther observe, that in Ecclesiastical Writers, εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ signifies Agreement

generally, as to Rites of Worship. Thus *Socrates* uses it, who having in several Instances, set forth the many

different Customs of the Christian

Churches within the *Roman Empire*, sums up all that he had said before in these words —

καὶ δὴν μὲν τοι παρ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ παρ'

πίστοις θρησκείαις εὐχῶν ἕκ' ἑστὶν τοῖς αὐτοῖς συμφωνήσας ἀλλήλαις

δύο εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ. Upon the whole matter (say's he)

'tis impossible to find every where among all

Churches two Services of Prayer, exactly agreeing with one another in every thing. Of all other

Circumstances, *Socrates* cannot mean to speak here of place. For it had been a ridiculous and absurd Observation, to have told

his Reader, that no two Churches, *e. g.* that

Rome and *Alexandria*, many hundred miles distant from one another, did agree to assemble

together in one and the same place.

L. 7. c. 18. p. 733.

Sozomen likewise has expressed himself much what to the same purpose — 'Ιουδαίαις ὅ καὶ οἱ ἱεροὶ καὶ οἱ τ' αὐτῶν τοῖς ἑταίροις καὶ οἱ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἑαυτοῦ. These (the Novatians) follow the Jews, and fall in exactly with the *Quartodecimans*, viz. as to the time of keeping *Easter*, of which the Historian is there writing. 'Tis impossible he should mean *Place*: For the *Novatians* (being Christians) could not celebrate *Easter*, that is, the Resurrection of Christ, in the same place as the Jews did their Passover or Deliverance out of *Egypt*. Nor could the *Novatians* agree with the Catholick *Quartodecimans* as to *Place*. For they had separated themselves from the Catholics, and would not communicate with them in Divine Worship.

Nor do I deny but that αὐτῶν may chance sometimes to denote *Place*, as *Acts* 2. 1. but whether so in *Ignatius*, is the Question: It must be determin'd from the Author himself, and his Design in that Passage. What I offer is, that notwithstanding *Ignatius's* words, there might have been several places for Worship at *Ephesus*, or several Congregations; and the holy Bishop might have exhorted 'em all in one general Admonition, to meet more frequently in their respective Congregations. May not one of our Bishops (suppose my Lord Bishop of *London*) properly enough exhort all his Parishes under his Care, in a circular Letter, to give diligence to assemble together more frequently; for that when
they

they are often assembled together the Powers of Satan are destroy'd: meaning, that their frequent assembling in their several respective Parish-Churches, and their Agreement in this godly and zealous Practice, is effectual unto that purpose: Besides, the whole period is thus — Endeavour to assemble together more frequently; for when ye are frequently together, the power of Satan is vanquish'd; and the Destruction (which he designs against you) is prevented (*τὴ ἑνωρίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως*) by the unity of your Faith. Here the Conjunction causal *ἵνα*, for, shews that *ἵνα ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ* must signify the same as *ἑνωρίᾳ*, and so specifies not the place of their assembling, but their agreement in the Action: And this is yet more clear, because 'tis added, — *ἡ τῆς ἑνωρίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως*. 'Twas the unity of their Faith and Practice Ignatius speaks of, not of the place: For the former would destroy the Power of the Devil, though they assembled in two hundred places at a time.

As for the *ἡ ὁμοθυμαδόν* in the Epistle of Ignatius to the *Magnesians*, I am well content it should receive Light from St. Cyprian's *Altare contra Altare*. I agree with J. O. that to be *infra Altare* is to be in Church-Communion; that to set *Altare contra Altare* is to be a Separatist: Yet for all this, there may be several Altars under one and the same Bishop, and in several places of Worship, provided they be not set up in Opposition to the Bishop,

L 3

but

but with his consent, and by his Approbation. If they be, they are all *unum Altare*, one Altar, as being under one Bishop. For as the Apostle in another case argues, 1 Cor. 10. 17. — *We being many are one bread and one body: For we are all partakers of that one body, viz. the Body of Christ*, vers. 16. So the *Magnesian* being many Congregations, and having many particular Altars, there was however but one Altar. For they were all one Body, subject to one Bishop, and all partakers of that then one Bishop. Briefly, he plainly enough intimates, that there were more than one particular Altar — *vis, &c. — run all together as unto (one) Temple of God, as unto one Altar.* As implies that there were more than one: nevertheless they were to be so perfectly united among themselves, under the Bishop, (for in this very Paragraph he is pressing Obedience to the Bishop) as if they were but one Congregation, and had but one Altar.

J. O. pag. 11. J. O. has not in this place handled that Point about the number of Churches in *Constantinople* as he ought, but makes his Reader believe there were but two in that City in *Constantine's* days, which is a gross Error. For L. 1. c. 16. though *Socrates* mentions only the Temple of *Irene*, and that other of the Apostles, being the most magnificent; yet *Eusebius* witnesses, that there were many Temples, many Churches, many Houses of God:

God: and *J. O.* cannot blow down all these many Churches (except two) with one blast of his mouth. Let any one judge whether there were not very many in *C. P.* by what *Eusebius*, *Constantine's* Favourite, and the Writer of his Life, has left upon Record, in the following words, *ὅτι ἡ ἐκκλησία*
αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἔχεν καὶ ἑκατὶ ἐκκλησίας *Hist. Constant.*
καὶ ἐκκλησίας, μαρτυρίας τε μεγίστας *l. 3. c. 48.*
ἡ ὁλοκατεσθιάσας οἰκίας τοῖς ἰσὺς τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἡ
αὐτῇ προσέδοται. But *Constantine* honouring the City
 call'd by his name, adorn'd it with many Orato-
 ries, and with very great Churches dedicated to
 the Martyrs, and with most splendid Houses of
 God, some in the Suburbs, some within the City.

'Tis more probable they were two hundred, than but two. But I am got out of my Province: I leave this matter to be decided between *J. O. Mr. B.* and *Mr. Clarkson* on one side, and *Dr. Maurice* on *Pag. 33.* the other.

Now follows the Neck-blow, as *J. O.* imagines; and 'tis ten Pound to a Crown that he wins the Battel: But the comfort is, I have heard of such Odds lost. He observes, that *Ignatius* exhorts *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* thus --- *μὴ ἐπὶ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου δούλος ἢ δούλα*
μὴ σκλάβος. Enquire after all by name: Despise not Men-servants nor Maid-servants. 'Tis a clear case now, he thinks. "I leave it (says he) to such as are willing to understand the Truth, to consider how great *Polycarp's* Church was, when the Bishop himself was

“ to look after every one by name, even the
 “ Men-servants and the Maids.” After this
 manner our Author sings *to triumph*. Well,
 but since he is so courteous as to give us
 time to consider this Passage, I for my share
 being willing to understand the Truth, and
 to embrace it also, have examin’d these
 words of *Ignatius* with all the Fairness I am
 able. *Zētē* in the New Testament signifies to
 seek the Conversion of Unbelievers; *Luk. 19.*
10. — *the son of man came to seek and to save*
that which was lost; Ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι. If then
 it was *Ignatius’s* meaning, that *Polycarp* was
 to endeavour the Conversion of every single
 Person in *Smyrna*, though of the meanest
 Rank and Condition, and himself in person to
 deal with every one of ’em, not the very
 Slaves excepted; then *J. O.* has made not
 only the Christians, but the whole Inhabitants
 of this City of *Smyrna* so few, that one Man
 was able to look after them all by Name, in
 order to their Salvation; or, he has reduc’d
 this great City to a small Village; which is
 more than Mr. *Clarkson* himself durst venture
 to do. But if this were so, what needed *Pol-*
ycarp to have so many Presbyters and Dea-
 cons to be assistant to him here in the Work
 of the Gospel? and why should so small a
 number of Christians (as *J. O.* supposes) be
 put to the Expence of maintaining so many
 unnecessary and idle Priests? By *πάντας*, all, I
 therefore understand not *singulos generum*, not
 every individual Person of every State and
 Con-

Condition, but *genera singulorum*, all States and Conditions of Men, even the lowest of 'em, the Slaves: For so Ignatius explains himself; adding — *despise not Men servants and Maid-servants*, that is, take care of all sorts and ranks of Men among you, even of the Meanest, as well as of the Rich and Honourable. The only Difficulty here is, whether *ὅτι ἰσχυρῶς*, *by name*, will bear this Sense: I think it will. *Onus Name* signifies (*Mat. 10. 41, 42.*) not individual or single Persons, but the common Qualities of some certain sorts of Men, as *the name of a Disciple*, and *the name of a Prophet*. To the same Effect S. Paul writes *Eph. 1. 21.* — *And has set him (Jesus Christ) at his own right hand, far above Principalities and Powers, and Might, and Dominion, and every name that is named — that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, &c.* And we know who they are that by the name Jesus will not here understand the Word consisting of two Syllables and five determinate Letters, but the Virtue, Power, and Efficacy of the Lord Jesus Christ. So then Name denotes the Condition and Qualities of Men very frequently. Thus *Polycarp* might look after all by Name, as well Servants as Masters, as well Mechanicks and Artificers as rich Shop-keepers and Merchants. I am persuaded J. O. will think himself oblig'd thus to interpret *Mark 16. 15.* — *preach the Gospel to every Creature, πᾶσι τῷ κτίῳ*, that is,

to

to all sorts and conditions of Men, and to *all Nations*, *Mat. 28. 19.* not every individual Man, no nor to every single Nation: That could not be intended, because it was impossible for the Apostles to do it, and we know they never did it; but to every Creature and to every Nation as opportunity served, not making a Difference between 'em. So was *Polycarp* to look after all the *Smyrnaans*, of what Quality or Condition soever they were, that is, he was not to despise or wilfully overlook any, even the meanest Rank among 'em: but it will no more hence follow that he was to seek after every single individual Person, than that the Apostles were to preach the Gospel unto every single and individual Creature in the World.

But let it be granted that *πᾶσι τῶν σμυρναίων* signifies every individual *Smyrnaan*, and that *Polycarp* was admonish'd thus to seek 'em all and every one of 'em, yet this ought to be understood with allowance, as if *Ignatius* had added, *as much as in thee lies, and according to thy power*; for the good Man in the very same Epistle (Parag. 1.) expresseth himself thus cautiously — *Τὸς ἅπας ἀνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες* *Sic adan*, speak to every single Man as God shall enable thee, or to the best of thy power. But then this implies not that the Christians in *Smyrna* were no more than one Man could deal with, even as that place in *Mark* intimates; not that all Mankind were so few in number that the Twelve Apostles could preach
the

the Gospel to *every* one of them. Lastly, it is not an improbable Sense to say that the words are to be understood of *Polycarp's* general Oversight and Episcopal Care, whilst the Execution thereof was to be committed unto the inferiour Presbyters and Deacons; as if *Ignatius* had said — “ Take care that
 “ all by name, every single person, of what
 “ rank and condition soever, be sought after
 “ (as much as in you lies) and converted
 “ to the Faith; make it thy business, and
 “ give it in charge to thy Presbyters and
 “ Deacons, that no one, not the poorest nor
 “ obscurest, be neglected or over-look'd.

After all this, I will offer an Observation out of *St. Ignatius's* Epistle to the *Smyrnaans*, to prove, that the Church in that City consisted of more Congregations than one; and I think my Argument will be found better than any *J. O.* has produc'd to the contrary, unless I flatter my self by an unusual Charitism. My Observation is this, how that *Ignatius* (parag. penult. of that Epistle) thus addresses to the Bishop — *It will be fit, (O most worthy Polycarp) to gather συμελικὴν διακονίαν, a most venerable and august Assembly, &c.* Now this august and venerable Council was (I suppose) to consist not of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, gathered out of other Churches, (that were to make *Polycarp* an Archbishop, which *J. O.* will by no means like,) but out of those who belong'd to his own Church of *Smyrna*. I cannot

no_e

not prevail with my self to think, but that *συμβούλιον διωρημένον*, an *angust Council*, implies a great number of venerable Presbyters and Deacons: For it would be extremely silly to exhort the Rector of a little Parish to send for his Curate, and suppose a Chapel-Minister under him, to meet upon some special occasion, and then call this *συμβούλιον διωρημένον*, an *angust and venerable Council*. If then *Polycarp* had under him a great many Presbyters and Deacons, who being met together made a Council, which deserv'd that honourable Character to be call'd *διωρημένον*, I make account that the Bishop of *Smyrna* had many Congregations under him, or that this little Church (as *J. O.* believes it) swarm'd with a number of idle and unnecessary Presbyters, which no Man in his Wits will believe.

The Exposition of Angels in the *Revelations* of *John* to the seven Churches of *Asia*, which I have already given chap. 3. tho new (for so it is for any thing that I know) is, I am verily perswaded, true; and so I shall be perswaded till I see a better, or mine confuted. I will here add one more Testimony of Scripture in Proof of that current Opinion among the Jews, That every Nation had its Guardian-Angel; whereunto St. *John* alludes when he styles the Bishop of every of the seven Churches *the Angel* thereof. That place of Scripture whereupon I grounded my self before, is otherwise in the Hebrew Copy, and there-

therefore rejected by many Learned Men. But that there was such an Opinion among the Jews long before the days of Christ and his Apostles, may be evinc'd from *Dan. 10. 13.* where the Ruling Angel of the Kingdom of *Persia* is by the good Angel call'd *the Prince of the Kingdom of Persia*; and from *vers. 21.* where, by the foresaid good Angel, *Michael* is call'd *your Prince*, the Guardian-Governing Angel of the Jews; and *chap. 12. ver. 1.* the same *Michael* is thus describ'd, *the great Prince, which standeth for the Children of thy people*, that is, the Jews. In Allusion hereunto, I said that the Bishops of these Churches are call'd Angels, that is, the Princes and Rulers of those Churches.

But (says *J. O.*) *the Authoriz'd Bible calls the Angels Ministers* (in *Page 35.* the Contents of the *2d. Chap.*) Wonderful! what if a Man should say, they expres'd themselves too loosely and negligently? But I need not do so. Minister is a general word, which is apply'd to Jesus Christ, to the Angels, * to the Apostles, to the Bishops and Presbyters; and is the special Title of those Officers that are call'd Deacons. And what if the Church of *Ephesus*, at *Paul's* bidding the Elders farewell (*Acts 20.*) had several Bishops, 'tis nothing to the purpose here, when *Ignatius* is bidding them farewell, because *Ignatius* distinguishes between the Bishop and his Presbyters (which

St.

St. Paul did not.) Besides, the Bishop of *Syria* wrote his Letter to the *Ephesians* long after St. Paul had set a single Governour over them; unless J. O. will take upon him to prove, that *Ignatius* wrote to the *Ephesians* before that time, which would be an Undertaking worthy so learned a Man.

I see no difficulty, nor absurdity
 Page 16. (as J. O. pleads,) in saying that the several Presbyters and Ministers, of the seven respective Churches, were reckon'd (as distinguish'd from their Bishop) among, or with, the People; whilst in the mean time, I make account, they could not be included among the Stars and Angels, which were but seven, altho' they are indefinitely call'd Angels.

Rev. 1. 20. For, after this weak and trifling observation, 'tis manifest, that seven only are mention'd, one in the singular number ascrib'd unto each Church. In short, nothing is plainer, than that the seven Candlesticks were the seven Churches; the seven Stars and the seven Angels, were the seven Rulers of those seven Churches; and as I said, the inferior Ministers must be reckon'd under the name of Candlesticks (that is, the Churches.) For even the seven Angels, or Bishops themselves, are included in the name Candlesticks, or Churches, unless J. O. will say the Minister of a congregation is not included, as a part of that congregation. But J. O. argues that *many may be intended by one Angel*: If this be allow'd, why then may not many Altars be intended by one Altar?

Altar? and so a former Argument of J. O. is quite spoil'd. But this is just such another Paradox as that other, of *many Presbyters included under Timothy, and under Titus*. Nevertheless J. O. has found a way to prove, that Angel in the singular, signifies many. He tells us that many were included under that one Beast, *Rev. 13*. I am not convinc'd of that: I rather judge he was one individual Beast, tho' a Monster, having seven Heads. But, what if one should Fancy him just such another, as that prefixt before *Hobb's Leviathan*, a compound of all the People? It will not follow, that the Angels were such other Beasts, because the Angels are distinguish'd from the People. Briefly, the many little shifts, which J. O. insists on here, shew the infirmities of us Men, who, to save our selves from sinking, will catch at every Stick, or Straw, that is within our Reach. *It's Remarkable* (says he) *that of the seven Stars, 'tis said indefinitely they are the Angels, not seven, but many more, as J. O. intimates*. Now, I see nothing Remarkable in this; but J. O's Remarkable cross humour of contending about nothing.

But he proceeds to inform us, that *Angel is a name of Office* (that's very true, 'tis so sometimes, and so is Apostle, *Philip. 2. 25.*) *and not of order, as is agreed by the Learned*. He would have said (I imagine) not of order in this Place, as is agreed, by the Learned on his side. But for all this, I take Angel here to be, a name both of Office and Order; and indeed, I discern no real
dist in

distinction between 'em: For he who carries my Letters to my Correspondent, is a Carrier by Office; and all know there is such an order of Men among us, who we call Carriers. So Angel here is He, who was employ'd to carry the message of Christ to the Church of *Ephesus*. This was his (and his Brethrens) Office; and because there were many other such Angels, six more mention'd in the *Rev.* there was then such an Order of Church-Rulers, then call'd Angels, by a metaphor or allusion to the Heavenly Host of Angels, which is agreed by all the Learned, to be an Order of Creatures, who are the Ministers of God, in Ruling and Protecting his Church. He farther notes, and says,—*It is a strange consequence, that Angel should be Expounded Bishop, one that had Authority over other Ministers.* And I ingenuously confess, it would have been strange to me, had not I read in *Paul's* two Epistles, that *Timothy* had Authority over the whole Church of *Ephesus*; and again in *Ignatius*, that there was a single Governor of the Church of *Ephesus* by him call'd Bishop. Wherefore comparing all these three Evidences together, which mutually give and receive Light from each other, I do no more

doubt, that *Angel of the Church of*
Rev. 2. 1. *Ephesus*, signify's the supreme Ruler or Bishop of that Church, than I Question, that there was a Christian Church at *Ephesus* at that time. But 'tis no wonder it should be so strange to *J. O.* seeing it mortifies him not a little; but 'tis true however, let *J. O.* chide ne-

ver so cunningly. All the wonder is, that He cannot discern so bright a Demonstration.

Ay, but *St. John placeth the Presbyters next the Throne of Christ; himself and the Angels P. 16. farther off, at a greater distance.* This is design'd, to delude the poor ignorant People, and for that Reason, must be examin'd. He refers me to *Rev. 5. 11.* There I read in my *English and Greek Testament*, thus,——*And I beheld, and I heard, the voice of many Angels round about the Throne, and the Beasts, and the Elders.* All the Honour done to the Elders (or Presbyters) that I see is, that the Angels are nam'd in the first place, the Presbyters in the last, even after the Beasts. Blessed God! That men should have Eyes, and yet see not! If *J. O.* has manag'd this Argument honestly and sincerely, I'll henceforward renounce, all pretence to those scurvy pieces of Morality. But I shall (it may be) be told that *ζῶν* and *πρεσβυτέρων* are govern'd of *καλλέειν* or coupl'd with *δῆμι*, and that the Angels therefore being round about the Throne, and round about the Elders, implies they were not so near the Throne, as were the Elders. If it were so, 'tis but a douty Argument, and unworthy the Gentleman that offers it. But still I averr the contrary; that *πρεσβυτέρων* is govern'd of *οὐρανῷ*, and coupl'd with *ἀγγέλων*; I heard the voice of many Angels, and the voice of the Angels. For *v. 12.* 'tis said of 'em all, Angels, Beasts and Elders,——*they spake with a loud voice, &c.*

M

Yet

Yet once more: St. Paul (says Page 37. 7. O.) *prefers the Preaching Elders, before the Ruling Elders*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. that which he would be at in this short Remark (as I guess; for he himself forms no Argument upon it) is that, Presbyters who Preach, are Superior unto Bishops that Rule. But the Apostle intimates no such thing: Indeed he prefers the Elder, who Rules well, before him that does not Rule well, and prefers the Elder who Rules well, and also Labours in the Word and Doctrine, before him that only Rules well, but Labours not in the Word and Doctrine, as I have formerly noted. This I conceive is all that can be intended in that place: For the Comparison, is not between a Ruler only, and a Preacher only, simply and precisely consider'd; but between a Ruler, or Elder, that watches over his particular Congregation, and is diligent in Preaching the Word, and one that Labours not therein, which is nothing to the Question in hand.

I apprehend not what advantage Page 37. 7. O. can get, by supposing *Timothy* the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* mention'd in the *Revelations*. 'Tis no more impossible, that St. Paul's belov'd Son, Companion and Fellow-Labourer, shou'd *leave his first Love* (*Rev. 2. 2.*) than that *Judas*, the Apostle, shou'd betray his Master. We must not think, but that some of the Apostles Friends and Disciples, made Shipwrack of the Faith.

Faith. *Alexander* did so.* And why not *Timothy*? Not that I wou'd easily believe this of him. But 'tis not impossible, especially since it was not a final Apostacy, there being room for Repentance *Rev.* 2. 5. Nor do I see any inconvenience in believing that

Timothy was the Angel that *left his first Love*.

7. O. would make the Bishops Angels indeed, if they were not capable of Apostatizing. Furthermore, what can 7. O. get by this Note? Why, that *Timothy* was not the Angel of *Ephesus*, because so zealous and diligent a Person could never fall from his first Love. If this be so, then it must fall to the share of the Elders of *Ephesus*, according to 7. O. who affirms. that Angel signifies many Presbyters. But if so, then it follows; that the Presbyter-Bishops, or Elders of *Ephesus*, *left their first Love*. But I must confess, this is not so great a wonder; the Apostle having foretold, *Act.* 20. 30. —that of themselves should arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

But after all, there's nothing in this. Criticks will be busie, and advance Paradoxes, and who can help it? Nevertheless I cannot believe, that *Timothy* was that Angel: For tho' *Timothy* was but a young Man, when *Paul* wrote his 1st Epistle to him (*ch.* 4. 12.) and so might possibly, have reach'd to the time that *John* wrote the *Revelations*, which was about forty Years after: Yet it must be remembered 1. That in those

* *Act.* 19. 33. compar'd with 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. 2 *Tim.* 4. 14. So did *Demas*. 3 *Tim.* 4. 10. compar'd with *Col.* 4. 14. *Philem.* 24.

times, and in those Countries, a Man was accounted young, till he was forty years Old. But I'll suppose *Timothy* Thirty. If then he had been the Angel of *Ephesus*, he would have been Seventy years of Age, which is nothing probable: For 2. *Timothy* was an infirm Man 1 *Tim.* 5. 23. which induces me to believe, he could not be the Bishop or Angel of *Ephesus*, mentioned in the *Revelations*, because, 'tis not likely one that is infirm at Thirty, should live to Seventy years and upward: Finally, let it be Remembred, that (as I hope, 'tis before sufficiently made out) the matter of the Message, sent to the Angel, concern'd the Church of *Ephesus*. which is therefore reproach'd for *being leaving his first Love*. In a word, these trifling Observations of J. O. make nothing to the merits of the Cause, but are flung in our way, meerly to raise a Dust, to perplex and amuse the Reader; not to instruct him in the Truth: Whatever becomes of *Timothy*, the Angel, whoever he was, was Bishop of *Ephesus*.

Well, but now we are to expect the Matter put out of doubt. In order whereunto J. O. tells us out of Dr. *Lightsfoot*,——“that the
 “publick Minister of every Synagogue was
 “called the *Angel of the Church, the Bishop of the Congregation*. “That every Synagogue
 “had it's Bishop, it's Angel; that the Temple Worship was abolisht, being Ceremonial; that the Service of the Synagogue was
 “transplanted into the Christian Church, being

"ing moral; that hence the Ministers of the
 "Gospel receiv'd the Titles of the Ministers
 "of the Synagogues. And hence it must fol-
 "low, that Angel and Bishop must signifie the
 "Minister of a particular Congregation, not
 "the Ruler of many. But let us examine
 these things, what there is in them.

1. I note that *J. O.* proves not that there were more Angels or Bishops in a Synagogue than one; what's the meaning then of so many Presbyters, and of a Presbytery in every Church, to which *Ignatius* wrote? Or what Conformity is there, in this between Synagogues and Churches? He has not yet shewn us, that every Synagogue had a Presbytery or College of Presbyters.

2. Supposing the names Angel and Bishop borrow'd from the Synagogues, it will not follow, that the Power of a Christian Angel or Bishop, must be confin'd to one small Congregation. And this the rather, because I conceive the *Jewish* Synagogues, and their Rulers were subject to the High Priests and their Presbytery. But I would have all the little Christian Congregations throughout the World, Absolute and Independent. For so according to *J. O.* were the Synagogues.

3. It is not exactly enough exprest, when he say's the Temple-worship was Ceremonial. There was a great deal of Moral Worship in the Temple, and the Temple-worship, was as much the Pattern of the Christian, as was the Synagogue-worship. And if so, it may

as well be concluded, that the *Jewish* High Priests, the Secondary Priests, and the *Levites* were the Pattern of the Christian Hierarchy. Jesus Christ seems to have made it his; who being the High Priest, had his Apostles, and his 70 Disciples. The Fathers I am sure many of 'em have drawn the Parallel. Now that the Temple-worship, was as much the Pattern of the Christian, as was the Synagogue, is prov'd; Because the Moral Parts of Divine Worship, were perform'd in the Temple, as well as in the Synagogue; and the Ceremonial Parts of Divine Worship, were perform'd in the Synagogues, as well as in the Temple; I mean by Ancient Custom or Institution, before God was pleas'd to confine it to the Temple only.

4. The Temple, is in a peculiar manner, call'd *the House of Prayer*; and it was the place of Offering up unto God, Praise and Thanksgiving, and of reading the Law. Even the Apostles themselves resorted thither for these purposes, *Act. 3. 1.* There is good reason then to believe, that the Temple-Moral-worship was the Pattern of the Christians, and that according to *J. O's* way of Reasoning, the Christian Bishop answers to the *Jewish* High Priest.

5. Mr. *Bois*, I remember, scoffs at the Bishop of *London-Derry*, for arguing with Dr. *Lightsfoot*, from the uncertain Notions and Traditions of the *Rabbis*, as too weak to ground any thing upon them. But see the Partiality

lity of us Men. When Rabbinical Learning is of any Advantage, we are content to make the best use we can of it: If against us, we deride it as proceeding from Forgery or Dotage.

Here J. O. undertakes to demonstrate, that Presbyters ordain'd. Page 19.

His first Instance, in proof hereof is the Ordination of *Barnabas* and *Paul*, *Act.* 13. 1, 2, 3. I have clear'd this matter before ch. 1. The sum is, these Teachers were Prophets, and had a special Command and Commission from God for what they did. Now tho' Teachers were ordinary Presbyters, yet Prophets were not. In such extraordinary Cases as this, that is, by some particular Warrant from God, even a lay-Elder (I grant) yea the meanest Christian may ordain, as *Ananias* did.

But above all, I cannot comprehend, why J. O. should suggest that *Paul's laying Hands on Timothy, was not for Ordination; but might be for conferring the Holy Ghost.* Be it so. Even this was Ordination, see ch. 5. But why may not I as well say, that the Presbytery laid not Hands on *Timothy* for Ordination? There is but one Reason against it, that I can guess at, and that is, because ordinary Presbyters never conferr'd the Gift of the Holy Ghost; that we know of. He farther affirms, that *the Apostles did not assume to themselves the sole Power of Ordination, but took the Presby-*

ters for their Associates in the *Action*. I desire
 J. O. to prove this by any clear Testimony,
 alwayes provided the Prophets, (who were
 extraordinary Presbyters) be excepted. The
 Instance of *Paul's* joyning *Barnabas* will do
 him no service here. For *Barnabas* was not
 an ordinary Presbyter, as has been already
 prov'd, but an Apostle, *Act. 14. 4, 14.* and
Gal. 2. 9. But it is an unsufferable-piece
 of Artifice for our Author to pretend, that
Barnabas was then a Presbyter, because the
 Antients were of opinion he had been one
 of Christ's 70 Disciples. He might as well
 have affirm'd, that *Matthias* (another of the
 70, *Ensch. l. 1. c. 12.*) was but a Presbyter,
 who was, we know, chosen to succeed into
 the Episcopacy or Apostleship of *Judas*. As if a
 Person of an Inferiour Rank, may not be ad-
 vanc'd to an higher Degree. Tho' *Barnabas*
 had been one of Christ's 70 Disciples, the
 Scripture gives him the honour of being an
 Apostle. But 'tis no wonder that J. O. whose
 business it is to degrade the Ruling Bishops,
 even below the Preaching Elders,
 Page 47. should cast the Apostle *Barnabas*
 down into the Class of Elders. All
 the World knows that our Bishops were
 first Presbyters; it will not follow, that they
 still rem in ordinary Presbyters. Your Fal-
 lacy then will not down with any Man of
 ordinary Understanding. 'Tis so gross, that
 I must believe he himself knew he play'd the
 Sophister in this place. For what if Bishops
 suc-

succeed the Apostles, and Presbyters the 70. Disciples? Yet as one of the 70 Disciples, (*viz.* *Matthias*) was advanc'd to be an Apostle; so was another, *viz.* *Barnabas*, who when he ordain'd Elders with *Paul*, was an acknowledg'd Apostle, *ch.* 14 4, 14. The meaning then of those who express themselves thus, *that Bishops succeed the Apostles, and Presbyters the 70 Disciples*, is, not that he who was one of Christ's 70 Disciples, alwayes continu'd a Presbyter, but only, that Bishops (under Christ the Head) have the first place of Ecclesiastical Power, (as the Apostles had,) and Presbyters the second, as the 70 had. But surely for all this, *Barnabas*, once one of the 70, and once a Presbyter, might become an Apostle for all that, and was so, when he joyn'd with *Paul* in ordaining those Elders, *Act.* 14. 23. This then proves not that *St. Paul*. joyn'd Presbyters with him when he ordain'd. Lastly, let *J. O.* if he can, prove that *Timothy* laid on Hands in *Ephesus* not without Presbyters. His Reasoning from *Paul's* Example, is out of doors.

"*J. O's* next Argument is thus Page 51. 52.

"laid—Presbyters have pow-

"er to Preach, Baptize, and to Administer

"the Lords Supper, therefore they have pow-

"er to Ordain. He endeavours to prove his

Assumption. 1. Because those Ministerial Acts

are equal to that of ordaining. 2. Because

Parium par est Ratio. This looks pretty fine,

but let us feel what substance of Truth is in it.

I. I

1. I take it for no little Presumption for any one to determin roundly, which Ministerial Acts are greater or less, or equal. I know not by what Authority *J. O.* has so oft enter'd into the Comparison.

2. Preaching, Baptizing, and Administring the Lord's Supper, may be equal (for any thing I know) nay Superior to ordaining. But *J. O.*

has not made it out from that Passage—*Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach:* “Surely (*says J. O.*) He

means one of the highest Ministerial Acts, else he would have

said—*Christ sent me neither to Preach nor Baptize, but to Ordain,*

I Reply 1. That there are almost as many Blunders, as there are Words, in this Gloss upon that Place, not to say any thing of its obscurity.

2. *J. O.* has here alledg'd a Text of Scripture, which few ordinary Readers understand. 'Twere well, if he himself duly consider'd it. For which Reasons, and because many produce it against the Necessity of water Baptism, and to make our way the plainer, for a full and particular Answer to *J. O.* let us inquire into the meaning of *St. Paul's* saying;—*Christ sent him, not to baptize, &c.* The Case was this.

Paul being at *Corinth*, to Preach the Gospel (*Act. 18.*) and meeting much opposition from the *Jews*, (*v. 5, 6.*) turn'd to the *Gentiles*, *v. 6.* God was pleas'd to comfort and encourage him
in

in the design, saying to him in a Vision, — *I have much people in this City, v. 10.* Here therefore he continu'd a year and half, *v. 11.* and was wholly taken up in Teaching, and Converting that *much people*, spoken of in the Vision, whilst his Fellow-labourers were employ'd in Baptizing 'em. But so it happen'd that some time after, this flourishing Church of *Corinth* fell into Divisions; the pretence whereof was, that every one was inclin'd to follow that Minister who Baptiz'd him, as is plainly to be gather'd from *1 Cor. 1. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. ver.* Whereupon, the Apostle undertaking to reprove 'em by this Epistle, among other things tells them (and thanks God for it) that he had Baptized few or none of them, that is, that he was not so much as an occasion of their Schisms, and that because *Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach*; that is, the people to be converted was so *much*, and *Paul's* work to Instruct 'em in the mystery of the Gospel so great, that all his time and pains, was in a manner, on that business, whilst others Baptiz'd 'em. God in his wise Providence so order'd it here at *Corinth*, that he seem'd in effect, to be sent not to Baptize, but to Preach; or his main Work was to Preach, not to Baptize, which prov'd greatly to his Satisfaction, in as much as he was not an occasion of their Divisions. But for all this, doubtless, generally speaking, *Paul* was sent (as well as the other Apostles (*Mat. 28. 19.*) to Baptize also, else he could not have Baptized *Crispus* and *Gaius*, and the

Hous.

Houſhold of *Stephanas*, 1 *Cor.* I. 14, 16. Let us now enquire what Concluſions can fairly be drawn hence, and what cannot.

1. It is truly hence to be deduc'd, that Preaching the Word, is a work of more difficulty and labour, than Baptizing; and the manifeſt Reaſon is, becauſe it requires more parts, and gifts, and knowledg in the Myſteries of the Goſpel, then Baptizing does. On this account it was, that *Paul* excelling his Fellow-Labourers in Spiritual Gifts and Abilities, to make known the Myſteries of Chriſt, betook himſelf to the Preaching of the Goſpel; leaving the Work of Baptizing, to his inferior Diſciples, and Fellow-helpers, But it does not hence follow, that Preaching is a more honourable Office than Baptizing: *St Paul* inſinuates no ſuch thing, only was glad that it ſo happen'd, that he had Baptiz'd few or none of 'em; and ſo the *Corinthians* could not ſay he had Baptiz'd in his own Name, v. 13. or had been the occaſion of their Schiſm.

2. Let what will become of the Office of Baptizing, be it inferior, or be it equal to Preaching or not, 'tis nothing to the preſent Queſtion: No one can hence gather any thing concerning the power of Ordaining: The Apoſtle ſpeaks not a word of it, nor had occaſion there to mention it. It may then be either the ſupreme, or the loweſt Miniſterial Act, or equal with the reſt, any thing here ſpoken by *St. Paul* notwithstanding.

3. It may be collected thence, that Preaching

ing was one of the highest Ministerial Acts ; but yet Ordaining may be higher than it for any thing *Paul* writes. *Paul* has not a word of Ordaining. To what purpose should he have mention'd it? That was no Occasion of the *Corinthian* Divisions. *St. Paul* could not therefore (except he had talk'd impertinently) have said — *Christ sent me neither to preach, nor to baptize, but to ordain.* It had been altogether foreign to his Argument to have said any such thing.

4. It may be gather'd thence, that Ordaining is an higher Ministerial Act than Baptizing. For *Paul* never committed the Ordaining Power unto the ordinary Presbyters, or to his Disciples, whilst himself was present, as he did the Work of Baptism at *Corinth*.

7. O. would fain know whether Christ did not mention the chiefest parts of a Minister's Work in these words, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them?* My Answer is, some he did, that's to say two, which he mention'd not before; other two, viz. Ordaining, and Ministering the Lord's Supper he did not, because he had before mention'd them; the one when he commanded *do this, Luke 22. 19.* the other *John 20. 21.* — *As my Father sent me, so send I you.* For the Father *Jo. 17. 18.* sent Christ with Power to send the Apostles : Therefore the Apostles were empower'd to send others; that is, to ordain others. For any thing then we see here,
Ordain

Ordaining may be a principal part of the Ministerial Office. Besides, I ask whether the Apostles were not ordain'd before they Preach'd, and whether Ministers are not to be ordain'd before they take upon 'em to dispense the Word and Sacraments; and whether Ordination confers not the Power of Ministring in the Word and Sacraments? If all this be true in the Affirmative, then, as our Lord seems to argue, that — *he who sends is greater than he who is sent*, Jo. 13. 16. so the Power of conferring other Powers is greater than those other Powers; that is, the Power of ordaining to the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments must needs be greater than the Power of exercising that Ministry. Moreover, although the Power of Ordaining, or rather the Execution of that Power requires not such Parts and Gifts as Preaching does (for herein, Baptizing, Administring the Lord's Supper, and Ordaining too, do yield unto the Work of Preaching;) yet the Power of Ordaining is a Trust of so great Importance unto Order, Peace, and the Welfare of the Church, that it seems more honourable than that of Preaching is.

'Twere endless to pursue our Author thro' all his little Niceties, which indeed are as foreign to the matter under debate, as they are obscure. After all this ado, and after so many words spent in vain, let Ordaining be suppos'd in its self but equal, or the least of the four Ministerial Acts so often mention'd; yet

yet (as I contend) it might be reserv'd by the Apostles to themselves, and to such only unto whom they intentionally and expressly communicated it. But contrary hereunto,

He informs us, *that* Pet. Lombard observ'd that the Ancients argu'd from *Baptism to Ordination*. Page 55. I leave the Truth of this Testimony to be examin'd by those who shall think fit to trace him thro' the Fathers and other ancient Writers: That's out of my Province at present, and I have enough of his Sincerity in the Misrepresentation he has made of *Eusebius*, and that more scandalous corrupting *St. Chrysostom*. All then I shall say here is, That if the Bishops are to be condemn'd for making use of such Weapons as were consecrated by the Papists, and J. O. takes upon him to censure them for it; with what Effrontery dares he at the same time call 'em in to his Assistance, and improve 'em to his own Advantage, and of his Party? A Man should always be careful of reproaching others, when himself is guilty in the same kind.

Oh but (J. O. argues) Presby- Page, 58
ters are ordain'd to the Office of the Ministry, of which the Ordaining Power is a branch. The Answer is obvious, they are not ordain'd to the Office of the Ministry, that is, of the whole Ministry; and Presbyters may be excluded out of a part of it, not by the arbitrary Will and Intention of the Ordainer (I affirm not that,) but by the Scriptu-

Scriptural Rule of Ordination, which I have set forth. Nay but he adds, — *If Presbyters are sent to preach and baptize, they are also sent to ordain, for it's included in their Commission*; meaning, it follows in the nature of the thing, according to his Maxim — *pari-um par est ratio.*

My Answer hereunto is, that a Gift or Power, or Office may be conferr'd upon a Person, who shall not have Authority to confer it upon another. As, in Civil Matters, the King dubs a Knight; but that Knight cannot dub another Knight. In Religion, a Presbyter Baptizes a Believer, but that Believer can't Baptize another Believer. Why then should it seem strange and incredible, that a Presbyter ordain'd by a Bishop, has not receiv'd thereby Power to ordain others? If indeed that Power did by Scripture Charter belong to Presbyters, then to pretend to deprive 'em of it were a nullity. As my Lord Mayor of *London's* Priviledges and Power that belong to His Lordship by the Kings Charter, 'twere in vain for the City that chuses him, to tell him he shall not have them; nor can their Intentions, nor their open Protestations to the contrary hinder. But the mischief is, this is not the Case before us; I desire this part of the Presbyters Charter; I mean that of Ordaining, I wish to see it, "or any evidence of it in Scripture. 'Tis truly "argu'd by *J. O.* (out of Mr. *Baxter*, I suppose) that tho' the Popish Ordainers did
 " not

“ not intentionally give the Power of Reform-
 “ ming to our first Reformers, yet our first
 “ Reformers took it upon themselves, not-
 “ withstanding (I may add) their Ordainers
 “ intended the quite contrary. Though the
 “ Popish Ordainers intended otherwise, yet
 “ their Intention was a Nullity. Very true! and that for two Reasons, neither of which has any place in the present Argument.

1. To reform from Sin and from Idolatry, is a natural Law and Duty, whereunto every, even private Person is oblig'd.

2. It is an exprefs Law and Duty prescrib'd in Scripture; *Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord.* Wherefore though our first Ordainers had been bound out from Reforming by exprefs Oath at their Ordination, it had been a Nullity: They must however have endeavour'd the Reformation, and had Power and inherent Authority to endeavour it. Now in the present Controversie about Presbyters Power to ordain, we have no natural Law for it, nor does the Scripture afford us any good Evidence of that their Power, especially as 'tis practis'd at this day, when Presbyters alone assume that Power to themselves, without any Law or President brought out of the Word of God.

There is one thing more I must not pass over, though I might well have mist of it, the Author having plac'd it at the latter end of his Book. 7. O.

Page. 179.

N

affirms

affirms here, that "if there be any Certain-
 "ty in this Succession, the Fathers ascribe
 "it to Presbyters, as much as to Bishops,

"*Ignatius* saith concerning them,
Ad Magn. " — That the Presbyters suc-
 cedeed in the place of the Bench
 "of the Apostles. There is no-

thing more unfair than to misrepresent the
 Meaning of an Author against the plain Sense
 that he intended it. The Words of *Ignatius*
 are spoken by way of Allusion unto Jesus
 Christ, as he was the visible Pastor of his
 little Flock upon Earth: *As* (so the Father
 means) *Jesus Christ was the Head, and the*
College of Apostles next to him, so the Bishop
(like Christ) is the President of the Magnesian
Church, the Presbyters (like the Apostles, next
to him. Or thus, As the Apostles were to
 Jesus Christ on Earth, his Seconds, so are
 the Presbyters unto the Bishop of the *Mag-*
nesians second unto him. What's this to the
 Presbyters succeeding the Apostles in their su-
 preme Power which they had after Christ's
 Ascension?

I had resolv'd at my first setting out, not
 to have descended lower than *Ignatius's* Epi-
 stles; but *J. O's* last disingenuous perverting
 the Sense of *Ignatius*, has put me upon the
 Examination of his next Testi-
 mony out of *Irenaeus*. For I must
 confess, I dare not trust him in
 any thing that he offers out of
 Antiquity. And I find him here just as I su-
 spected:

Advers. Hæres.
 lib. 3. cap. 2.

spected: In proof that Presbyters (in J. O's Sense) were the Apostles Successors, he produces these Words of that Father — *Cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem, qua est ab Apostolis, qua per successionem Presbyteriorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, &c.* Herein there are two things for which I have just Cause to tax J. O's Sincerity.

1. He writes *Presbyteriorum* (the Presbyteries) instead of *Presbyterorum* Presbyters; which very much alters the Case here, as we shall see anon.

2. Every one knows that the Bishops are frequently call'd by the Name of Presbyters, especially in *Irenaeus*. I am perswaded that J. O. (who has dabb'd in so many Authors that have handled this Subject) could not be ignorant hereof; and therefore like a Man wise in his Generation, turn'd Presbyters into Presbyteries, which if it were the true Reading, could in no wise be understood of the Bishops, but of the Colleges of Presbyters; and so would confirm his Position more plainly, viz.

— *That that Father ascribes the Certainty of Succession unto the Presbyters properly so call'd, or the Colleges of Presbyters.* But *Irenaeus* attributes it to the Presbyters, and by Presbyters he means the Bishops, as is manifest from Chap. 3. following, where pursuing the same Argument he says, — *Habemus annu-merare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, Par. 1.* And again *Par. 2.* — *Fidem per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem*
ad

ad nos. Now that *Irenaeus* speaks of Bishops in the true Ecclesiastical Sense, as distinguish'd from, and superior to Presbyters, appears from the Instance that he gives of the Roman Church, wherein he reckons *Linus, Anacletus, Clemens, Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telephorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter,* and *Eleutherius*. According then to *Irenaeus*, the Succession was in the single Bishops of Rome, whom he sometimes styles Presbyters, not in the Presbyters properly so called, nor in the Presbyteries; that is, in two Words, *J. O.* has dealt unfairly with his Reader in this place also.

F I N I S.
